

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal loving Father, we thank Thee for this world of beauty in the midst of which we walk, for the dawning of light out of darkness, for the gifts of love and of friendship, for sunny memories, and for every hope by which we are inspired.

Help us, then, to live worthily as Thy children; to be true and just in meeting every experience of this day; to rise above all worry, fretting, fear, and hatred, and to live in an atmosphere of spiritual serenity, knowing that Thy love is round us and that underneath are Thine everlasting arms.

Bless every home in our beloved land with the abiding spirit of the Master, that parental tenderness and understanding, together with filial devotion and obedience, may be restored, to the development of those highest and holiest relationships in life, and grant that from the altar of every fireside prayer may be set forth in Thy sight as the incense, and the lifting up of hands may be as an evening sacrifice. In Thy dear Son's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 24, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5488. An act to provide for the widening of Wisconsin Avenue in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5679. An act to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to fees of the United States marshal.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 828) to permit the President to acquire and convert, as well as to construct, certain auxiliary vessels for the Navy, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman
Andrews	Donahey	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Ashurst	Downey	King	Russell
Austin	Ellender	La Follette	Schwartz
Bailey	Frazier	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	George	Lodge	Sheppard
Barbour	Gerry	Logan	Shipstead
Barkley	Gibson	Lucas	Slattery
Bilbo	Gillette	Lundeen	Smathers
Bone	Glass	McCarran	Taft
Borah	Green	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Guffey	McNary	Thomas, Utah.
Bulow	Gurney	Maloney	Tobey
Burke	Hale	Mead	Townsend
Byrnes	Harrison	Miller	Truman
Capper	Hatch	Minton	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hayden	Murray	Wagner
Chavez	Herring	Norris	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Hill	Nye	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Holman	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Connally	Holt	Overton	
Danaher	Hughes	Pepper	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is engaged in the performance of duty as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy, and, therefore, is absent from the Senate today.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. I—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 262)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the clerk going to read the message?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has requested the clerk to read the message from the President of the United States, which, under the rules, is a privileged matter and may be laid before the Senate at any time.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939 (Public, No. 19, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), approved April 3, 1939, I herewith transmit reorganization plan No. I, which, after investigation, I have prepared in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the act; and I declare that with respect to each transfer, consolidation, or abolition made in reorganization plan No. I, I have found that such transfer, consolidation, or abolition is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1 (a) of the act.

In these days of ruthless attempts to destroy democratic government, it is baldly asserted that democracies must always be weak in order to be democratic at all; and that, therefore, it will be easy to crush all free states out of existence.

Confident in our Republic's 150 years of successful resistance to all subversive attempts upon it, whether from without or within, nevertheless, we must be constantly alert to the importance of keeping the tools of American democracy up to date. It is our responsibility to make sure that the people's government is in condition to carry out the people's will, promptly, effectively, without waste or lost motion.

In 1883, under President Arthur, we strengthened the machinery of democracy by the civil-service law; beginning in 1905 President Roosevelt initiated important inquiries into Federal administration; in 1911 President Taft named the Economy and Efficiency Commission, which made very important recommendations; in 1921, under Presidents Wilson and Harding, we tightened up our budgetary procedure. Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover in succession strongly recommended the rearrangement of Federal administrative activities. In 1937 I proposed, on the basis of an inquiry authorized and appropriated for by the Congress, the strengthening of the administrative management of the executive establishment.

None of all this long series of suggestions, running over more than a quarter of a century, was in any sense personal or partisan in design.

These measures have all had only one supreme purpose—to make democracy work, to strengthen the arms of democracy in peace or war, and to insure the solid blessings of free government to our people in increasing measure.

We are not free if our administration is weak. But we are free if we know, and others know, that we are strong; that we can be tough as well as tender-hearted; and that what the American people decide to do can and will be done,

capably and effectively, with the best national equipment that modern organizing ability can supply in a country where management and organization is so well understood in private affairs.

My whole purpose in submitting this plan is to improve the administrative management of the Republic, and I feel confident that our Nation is united in this central purpose, regardless of differences upon details.

This plan is concerned with the practical necessity of reducing the number of agencies which report directly to the President, and also of giving the President assistance in dealing with the entire executive branch by modern means of administrative management.

Forty years ago, in 1899, President McKinley could deal with the whole machinery of the executive branch through his 8 Cabinet Secretaries and the heads of 2 commissions, and there was but 1 commission of the so-called quasi-judicial type in existence. He could keep in touch with all the work through 8 or 10 persons.

Now, 40 years later, not only do some 30 major agencies (to say nothing of the minor ones) report directly to the President, but there are several quasi-judicial bodies which have enough administrative work to require them also to see him on important executive matters.

It has become physically impossible for one man to see so many persons, to receive reports directly from them, and to attempt to advise them on their own problems which they submit. In addition the President today has the task of trying to keep their programs in step with each other or in line with the national policy laid down by the Congress. And he must seek to prevent unnecessary duplication of effort.

The administrative assistants provided for the President in the Reorganization Act cannot perform these functions of over-all management and direction. Their task will be to help me get information and condense and summarize it—they are not to become in any sense Assistant Presidents, nor are they to have any authority over anybody in any department or agency.

The only way in which the President can be relieved of the physically impossible task of directly dealing with 30 or 40 major agencies is by reorganization—by the regrouping of agencies according to their major purposes under responsible heads who will report to the President, just as is contemplated by the Reorganization Act of 1939.

This act says that the President shall investigate the organization of all agencies of the Government and determine what changes are necessary to accomplish any one or more of five definite purposes:

- (1) To reduce expenditures.
- (2) To increase efficiency.
- (3) To consolidate agencies according to major purposes.
- (4) To reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions and by abolishing such as may not be necessary.
- (5) To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

It being obviously impracticable to complete this task at one time, but having due regard to the declaration of Congress that it should be accomplished immediately and speedily, I have decided to undertake it promptly in several steps.

The first step is to improve the over-all management; that is, to do those things which will accomplish the purposes set out in the law, and which at the same time will reduce the difficulties of the President in dealing with the multifarious agencies of the executive branch and assist him in distributing his responsibilities as the chief administrator of the Government by providing him with the necessary organization and machinery for better administrative management.

The second step is to improve the allocation of departmental activities, that is, to do those things which will accomplish the purposes set out in the law and at the same time help that part of the work of the executive branch which is carried on through executive departments and agencies. In all this the responsibility to the people is through the President.

The third step is to improve intradepartmental management; that is, to do those things which will enable the heads of departments and agencies the better to carry out their own duties and distribute their own work among their several assistants and subordinates.

Each of these three steps may require from time to time the submission of one or more plans involving one or more reorganizations, but it is my purpose to fulfill the duty imposed upon me by the Congress as expeditiously as practicable and to the fullest extent possible in view of the exceptions and exemptions set out in the act.

The plan I now transmit is divided into four parts or sections which I shall describe briefly as follows:

PART 1. EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

In my message to the Congress of January 12, 1937, in discussing the problem of how to improve the administrative management of the executive branch, I transmitted with my approval, certain recommendations for strengthening and developing the management arms of the President. Those three management arms deal with (1) Budget, and efficiency research, (2) planning, and (3) personnel. My accumulated experience during the 2 years since that time has deepened my conviction that it is necessary for the President to have direct access to these managerial agencies in order that he may have the machinery to enable him to carry out his constitutional responsibility, and in order that he may be able to control expenditures, to increase efficiency, to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort, and to be able to get the information which will permit him the better to advise the Congress concerning the state of the Union and the program of the Government.

Therefore, I find it necessary and desirable in carrying out the purposes of the act to transfer the Bureau of the Budget to the Executive Office of the President from the Treasury Department. It is apparent from the legislative history of the Budget and Accounting Act that it was the purpose in 1921 to set up an executive budget for which the President would be primarily responsible to the Congress and to the people, and that the Director of the Budget was to act under the immediate direction and supervision of the President. While no serious difficulties have been encountered because of the fact that the Bureau of the Budget was placed in the Treasury Department so far as making budgetary estimates has been concerned, it is apparent that its coordinating activities and its research and investigational activities recently provided for by the Congress, will be facilitated if the Bureau is not a part of one of the 10 executive departments. Also, in order that the Bureau of the Budget may the better carry out its work of coordination and investigation, I find it desirable and necessary in order to accomplish the purposes of the act to transfer to the Bureau of the Budget the functions of the Central Statistical Board.

By these transfers to the Executive Office, the President will be given immediate access to that managerial agency which is concerned with the preparation and administration of the Budget, with the coordination of the work of the governmental agencies, and with research and investigation necessary to accomplish the five definite purposes of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

I also find it necessary and desirable to transfer to the Executive Office of the President the National Resources Committee, now an independent establishment, and to consolidate with it by transfer from the Department of Commerce the functions of the Federal Employment Stabilization Office, the consolidated unit to be known as the National Resources Planning Board. This Board would be made up as is the present Advisory Board of the National Resources Committee of citizens giving part-time services to the Government, who, aided by their technical staff, would be able to advise the President, the Congress, and the people with respect to plans and programs for the conservation of the national resources, physical and human. By these transfers to the Executive Office the President will be

given more direct access to and immediate direction over that agency which is concerned with planning for the utilization and conservation of the national resources, an indispensable part of the equipment of the Chief Executive.

On previous occasions I have recommended, and I hereby renew and emphasize my recommendation, that the work of this Board be placed upon a permanent statutory basis.

Because of an exemption in the act it is impossible to transfer to the Executive Office the administration of the third managerial function of the Government, that of personnel. However, I desire to inform the Congress that it is my purpose to name one of the administrative assistants to the President, authorized in the Reorganization Act of 1939, to serve as a liaison agent of the White House on personnel management.

In this manner the President will be given for the first time direct access to the three principal necessary management agencies of the Government. None of the three belongs in any existing department. With their assistance and with this reorganization, it will be possible for the President to continue the task of making investigations of the organization of the Government in order to control expenditures, increase efficiency, and eliminate overlapping.

PART 2. FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Studies heretofore made by me and researches made at my direction, as well as recommendations submitted by me to the Congress, and especially those contained in my message of January 12, 1937, indicate clearly that to carry out the purposes of the Reorganization Act of 1939 to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies of the Government according to major purposes and to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head would require the provision of 3 general agencies in addition to the 10 executive departments.

It is my objective, then, by transfer, consolidation, and abolition to set up a Federal Security Agency, a Federal Works Agency, and a Federal Loan Agency, and then to distribute among the 10 executive departments and these 3 new agencies the major independent establishments in the Government—excepting those exempt from the operations of the act—in order to minimize overlapping and duplication, to increase efficiency and to reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government.

I find it necessary and desirable to group in a Federal security agency those agencies of the Government, the major purposes of which are to promote social and economic security, educational opportunity, and the health of the citizens of the Nation.

The agencies to be grouped are the Social Security Board, now an independent establishment; the United States Employment Service, now in the Department of Labor; the Office of Education, now in the Department of the Interior; the Public Health Service, now in the Treasury Department; the National Youth Administration, now in the Works Progress Administration; and the Civilian Conservation Corps, now an independent agency.

The Social Security Board is placed under the Federal Security Agency, and at the same time the United States Employment Service is transferred from the Department of Labor and consolidated with the unemployment compensation functions of the Social Security Board in order that their similar and related functions of social and economic security may be placed under a single head and their internal operations simplified and integrated.

The unemployment compensation functions of the Social Security Board and the employment service of the Department of Labor are concerned with the same problem, that of the employment, or the unemployment, of the individual worker.

Therefore they deal necessarily with the same individual. These particular services to the particular individual also are bound up with the public assistance activities of the Social Security Board. Not only will these similar functions be more

efficiently and economically administered at the Federal level by such grouping and consolidation but this transfer and merger also will be to the advantage of the administration of State social security programs and result in considerable saving of money in the administrative costs of the governments of the 48 States as well as those of the United States. In addition to this saving of money there will be a considerable saving of time and energy not only on the part of administrative officials concerned with this program in both Federal and State Governments but also on the part of employers and workers, permitting through the simplification of procedures a reduction in the number of reports required and the elimination of unnecessary duplication in contacts with workers and with employers.

Because of the relationship of the educational opportunities of the country to the security of its individual citizens, the Office of Education, with all of its functions, including, of course, its administration of Federal-State programs of vocational education, is transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Federal Security Agency. This transfer does not increase or extend the activities of the Federal Government in respect to education, but does move the existing activities into a grouping where the work may be carried on more efficiently and expeditiously, and where coordination and the elimination of overlapping may be better accomplished. The Office of Education has no relationship to the other functions of the Department of the Interior.

The Public Health Service is transferred from the Treasury Department to the Federal Security Agency. It is obvious that the health activities of the Federal Government may be better carried out when so grouped than if they are left in the Treasury, which is primarily a fiscal agency, and where the necessary relationships with other social security, employment, and educational activities now must be carried on by an elaborate scheme of interdepartmental committee work.

The National Youth Administration is transferred from the Works Progress Administration to the Federal Security Agency since its major purpose is to extend the educational opportunities of the youth of the country and to bring them through the processes of training into the possession of skills which enable them to find employment. Other divisions of the Federal Security Agency will have the task of finding jobs, providing for unemployment compensation, and other phases of social security, while still other units of the new agency will be concerned with the problem of primary and secondary education, as well as vocational education and job training and retraining for employment. While much of the work of the National Youth Administration has been carried on through work projects, these have been merely the process through which its major purpose was accomplished, and, therefore, this agency under the terms of the act should be grouped with the other security agencies rather than with the work agencies.

For similar reasons the Civilian Conservation Corps, now an independent establishment, is placed under the Federal Security Agency, because of the fact that its major purpose is to promote the welfare and further the training of the individuals who make up the corps, important as may be the construction work which they have carried on so successfully. The Civilian Conservation Corps is a small coordinating agency which supervises work carried on with the cooperation of several regular departments and independent units of the Government. This transfer would not interfere with the plan of work heretofore carried on, but it would enable the Civilian Conservation Corps to coordinate its policies, as well as its operations, with those other agencies of the Government concerned with the educational and health activities and with human security.

PART 3. FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

In order to carry out the purpose of the Reorganization Act of 1939, I find it necessary and desirable to group and consolidate under a Federal Works Agency those agencies of the Federal Government dealing with public works not

incidental to the normal work of other departments, and which administer Federal grants or loans to State and local governments or other agencies for the purposes of construction.

The agencies so to be grouped are the Bureau of Public Roads, now in the Department of Agriculture; the Public Buildings Branch of the Procurement Division, now in the Treasury Department, and the Branch of Building Management of the National Park Service, so far as it is concerned with public buildings which it operates for other departments or agencies, now in the Department of the Interior; the United States Housing Authority, now in the Department of the Interior; the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, familiarly known as P. W. A.; and the Works Progress Administration, familiarly known as W. P. A., except the functions of the National Youth Administration.

The transfer of both the Public Works Administration and the Works Progress Administration to the new Federal Works Agency would provide for both principal types of public works that have been carried on by the Federal Government directly or in cooperation with the State and local governments. I find that it will be possible to reduce administrative costs as well as to improve efficiency and to eliminate overlapping by bringing these different programs of public works under a common head. But, because of the differences that justified their separate operation in the past and differences that will continue in the future to distinguish certain phases of major public works from work relief, I find it necessary to maintain them, at least for the present, as separate subordinate units of the Federal Works Agency.

The present Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works is placed under the Federal Works Agency under the shorter name of Public Works Administration.

The name of the Works Progress Administration has been changed to Works Projects Administration in order to make its title more descriptive of its major purpose.

The Bureau of Public Roads is transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Federal Works Agency and as a separate unit under the name of Public Roads Administration. This will bring the administration of the Federal roads program with its grants-in-aid to the States into coordination with other major public-works programs and other programs of grants and loans to the States.

The construction and operation of many public buildings is now carried on in two agencies which are consolidated under the new Federal Works Agency, namely, the Public Buildings Branch of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, which is concerned with the construction of Federal buildings and with the operation of many public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and the Branch of Building Management of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, which is concerned with the operation of public buildings in the District of Columbia. These two separate activities are consolidated in one unit, to be known as the Public Buildings Administration. Improved efficiency, coordination of effort, and savings will result from this transfer and consolidation.

Then, also, there is transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Federal Works Agency the United States Housing Authority. The major purpose of the United States Housing Authority is to administer grants-in-aid and loans to local public housing authorities in accordance with its established standards of construction in that part of the housing field which cannot be reached economically by private enterprise. For these reasons, it should be grouped with those other agencies which have to do with public works, with grants and loans to State and local governments, and with construction practices and standards.

PART 4. FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY AND TRANSFERS OF INDEPENDENT LENDING AGENCIES

In order to carry out the purposes of the Reorganization Act of 1939 I find it necessary and desirable to group under a Federal Loan Agency those independent lending agencies of the Government which have been established from time to

time for the purpose of stimulating and stabilizing the financial, commercial, and industrial enterprises of the Nation.

The agencies to be so grouped in the Federal Loan Agency are: The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Electric Home and Farm Authority, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration and their associated agencies and boards, as well as the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Since 1916 the Congress has established from time to time agencies for providing loans, directly or indirectly, for the stimulation and stabilization of agriculture, and such agencies should in my opinion be grouped with the other agricultural activities of the Government. For that reason I find it necessary and desirable to accomplish the purposes of the act to transfer the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation and associated agencies to the Department of Agriculture.

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

One of the five purposes of the Reorganization Act of 1939 is "to reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government." This purpose is important in each phase of the plan here presented. The Reorganization Act prohibits abolishing functions—in other words basic services or activities performed. Therefore the reduction in expenditures to be effected must necessarily be brought about chiefly in the overhead administrative expenses of the agencies set up to perform certain functions. The chance for economy arises therefore not from stopping work, but from organizing the work and the overhead more efficiently in combination with other similar activities. Only the Congress can abolish or curtail functions now provided by law.

The overhead administrative costs of all the agencies affected in reorganization plan No. 1 is about \$235,000,000. This does not include the loans they make, the benefits they pay, the wages of the unemployed who have been given jobs, it does not include the loans and grants to States or, in short, the functional expense. It does include the overhead expense of operating and administering all these agencies.

The reduction of administrative expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the plan is estimated as nearly as may be at between \$15,000,000 and \$20,000,000 annually, a substantial lowering of the existing overhead. Certain of these economies can be brought about almost immediately, others will require a painstaking and gradual readjustment in the machinery and business practices of the Government.

Any such estimate is incomplete, however, without reference to the corresponding savings which will follow in the States and cities through the recommended consolidation of the Federal services with which they cooperate, and the improved efficiency and convenience which will be felt by citizens all over the Nation, many of whom will be able to find in a single office many of the services now scattered in several places. These economies will undoubtedly exceed the direct savings in the Federal Budget.

It will not be necessary to ask the Congress for any additional appropriations for the administrative expenses of the three consolidated agencies set up in this plan, since their costs will be met from funds now available for the administrative expenses of their component units. Actually new expenses will be only a fractional part of the expected savings.

Neither on this reorganization plan No. 1 nor on future reorganization plans, covering interdepartmental changes and intradepartmental changes, will every person agree on each and every detail. It is true that out of the many groupings and regroupings proposed in this message a few of the individual agencies could conceivably be placed elsewhere.

Nevertheless, I have been seeking to consider the functional origin and purpose of each agency as required by the reorganization bill itself.

If in the future experience shows that one or two of them should be regrouped, it will be wholly possible for the President and the Congress to make the change.

The plan presented herewith represents 2 years of study. It is a simple and easily understood plan. It conforms to methods of executive administration used by large private enterprises which are engaged in many lines of production. Finally, it will save a sum of money large in comparison with the existing overhead of the agencies involved.

I trust, therefore, that the Congress will view the plan as a whole and make it possible to take the first step in improving the executive administration of the Government of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 25, 1939.

Reorganization plan No. I, accompanying the President's message, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. I

Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled April 25, 1939, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939, approved April 3, 1939

PART 1. EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SECTION 1. Bureau of the Budget: The Bureau of the Budget and all of its functions and personnel (including the Director and Assistant Director) are hereby transferred from the Treasury Department to the Executive Office of the President, and the functions of the Bureau of the Budget shall be administered by the Director thereof under the direction and supervision of the President.

Sec. 2. Central Statistical Board: The Central Statistical Board and all of its functions and personnel (including the Chairman and the members of the Board) are hereby transferred to the Bureau of the Budget in the Executive Office of the President. The Chairman of the Board shall perform such administrative duties as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall direct.

Sec. 3. Central Statistical Committee abolished and functions transferred: The Central Statistical Committee is hereby abolished and its functions are transferred to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be administered by him under the direction and supervision of the President. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall promptly wind up any outstanding affairs of the Central Statistical Committee.

Sec. 4. National Resources Planning Board: (a) The functions of the National Resources Committee, established by Executive Order No. 7065 of June 7, 1935, and its personnel (except the members of the committee) and all of the functions of the Federal employment stabilization office in the Department of Commerce and its personnel are hereby transferred to the Executive Office of the President. The functions transferred by this section are hereby consolidated, and they shall be administered under the direction and supervision of the President by the National Resources Planning Board (hereafter referred to as the Board), which shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President. The President shall designate one of the members of the Board as chairman and another as vice chairman. The vice chairman shall act as chairman in the absence of the chairman or in the event of a vacancy in that office. The members of the Board shall be compensated at the rate of \$50 per day for time spent in attending and traveling to and from meetings or in otherwise exercising the functions and duties of the Board, plus the actual cost of transportation: *Provided*, That in no case shall a member be entitled to receive compensation for more than 30 days' service in 2 consecutive months.

(b) The Board shall determine the rules of its own proceedings, and a majority of its members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but the Board may function notwithstanding vacancies.

(c) The Board may appoint necessary officers and employees and may delegate to such officers authority to perform such duties and make such expenditures as may be necessary.

Sec. 5. National Resources Committee abolished: The National Resources Committee is hereby abolished, and its outstanding affairs shall be wound up by the National Resources Planning Board.

Sec. 6. Federal Employment Stabilization Office abolished: The Federal Employment Stabilization Office is hereby abolished, and the Secretary of Commerce shall promptly wind up its affairs.

Sec. 7. Transfer of records and property: All records and property (including office equipment) of the several agencies transferred, or the functions of which are transferred, by this part are hereby transferred to the Executive Office of the President for use in the administration of the agencies and functions transferred by this part.

Sec. 8. Transfer of funds: So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940) for the use of any agency in the exercise of any functions transferred by this part, or for the use of the head of any department or agency in the exercise of any functions so transferred, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, shall be transferred to the

Executive Office of the President for use in connection with the exercise of functions transferred by this part. In determining the amount to be transferred the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer: *Provided*, That the use of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds transferred by this section shall be subject to the provisions of section 4 (d) (3) and section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

Sec. 9. Personnel: Any personnel transferred by this part found to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the efficient administration of the functions transferred by this part shall be retransferred under existing law to other positions in the Government service, or separated from the service subject to the provisions of section 10 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

PART 2. FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

SECTION 201. Federal Security Agency: (a) The United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor and its functions and personnel are transferred from the Department of Labor; the Office of Education in the Department of the Interior and its functions and personnel (including the Commissioner of Education) are transferred from the Department of the Interior; the Public Health Service in the Department of the Treasury and its functions and personnel (including the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service) are transferred from the Department of the Treasury; the National Youth Administration within the Works Progress Administration and its functions and personnel (including its Administrator) are transferred from the Works Progress Administration; and these agencies and their functions, together with the Social Security Board and its functions, and the Civilian Conservation Corps and its functions, are hereby consolidated under one agency to be known as the Federal Security Agency, with a Federal Security Administrator at the head thereof. The Federal Security Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary at the rate of \$12,000 per annum. He shall have general direction and supervision over the administration of the several agencies consolidated into the Federal Security Agency by this section and shall be responsible for the coordination of their functions and activities.

(b) The Federal Security Administrator shall appoint an Assistant Federal Security Administrator, who shall receive a salary at the rate of \$9,000 per annum, and he may also appoint such other personnel and make such expenditures as may be necessary.

(c) The Assistant Administrator shall act as Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in that office and shall perform such other duties as the Administrator shall direct.

(d) The several agencies and functions consolidated by this section into the Federal Security Agency shall carry with them their personnel.

Sec. 202. Social Security Board: The Social Security Board and its functions shall be administered as a part of the Federal Security Agency under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator. The Chairman of the Social Security Board shall perform such administrative duties as the Federal Security Administrator shall direct.

Sec. 203. United States Employment Service: (a) The functions of the United States Employment Service shall be consolidated with the unemployment-compensation functions of the Social Security Board and shall be administered in the Social Security Board in connection with such unemployment compensation functions under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator.

(b) The office of the Director of the United States Employment Service is hereby abolished, and all of the functions of such office are transferred to, and shall be exercised by, the Social Security Board.

(c) All functions of the Secretary of Labor relating to the administration of the United States Employment Service are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercised by, the Federal Security Administrator.

Sec. 204. Office of Education: (a) The Office of Education and its functions shall be administered by the Commissioner of Education under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator.

(b) All functions of the Secretary of the Interior relating to the administration of the Office of Education are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercised by, the Federal Security Administrator.

Sec. 205. Public Health Service: (a) The Public Health Service and its functions shall be administered by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator.

(b) All the functions of the Secretary of the Treasury relating to the administration of the Public Health Service, except those functions relating to the acceptance and investment of gifts as authorized by sections 23 (b) and 137 (e), title 42, United States Code, are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercised by, the Federal Security Administrator.

Sec. 206. National Youth Administration: The National Youth Administration and its functions shall be administered by the National Youth Administrator under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator.

Sec. 207. Civilian Conservation Corps: The Civilian Conservation Corps and its functions shall be administered by the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator.

SEC. 208. Transfer of records and property: All records and property (including office equipment) of the several agencies which, with their functions, are consolidated by section 201 into the Federal Security Agency are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Security Agency for use in the administration of the agencies and functions consolidated by that section.

SEC. 209. Transfer of funds: So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940) available for the use of any agency in the exercise of any functions transferred by this part or for the use of the head of any department or agency in the exercise of any functions so transferred as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred for use in connection with the exercise of the functions transferred by this part. In determining the amount to be transferred the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer: *Provided*, That the use of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds transferred by this section shall be subject to the provisions of section 4 (d) (3) and section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

SEC. 210. Administrative funds: The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall allocate to the Federal Security Agency, from appropriations, allocations, or other funds available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940) for the administrative expenses of the agencies and functions consolidated by this part such sums, and in such proportions, as he may find necessary for the administrative expenses of the Federal Security Agency.

SEC. 211. Personnel: Any personnel transferred by this part found to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the efficient administration of the functions transferred by this part shall be retransferred under existing law to other positions in the Government service or separated from the service, subject to the provisions of section 10 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

PART 3. FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

SECTION 301. Federal Works Agency: (a) The Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Agriculture and its functions and personnel (including the Chief thereof) are transferred from the Department of Agriculture; the Public Buildings Branch of the Procurement Division in the Treasury Department and its functions and personnel are transferred from the Treasury Department; the Branch of Buildings Management of the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior and its functions and personnel (except those relating to monuments and memorials), and the functions of the National Park Service in the District of Columbia in connection with the general assignment of space, the selection of sites for public buildings, and the determination of the priority in which the construction or enlargement of public buildings shall be undertaken, and the personnel engaged exclusively in the administration of such functions, and the United States Housing Authority in the Department of the Interior and its functions and personnel (including the Administrator), are transferred from the Department of the Interior; and all of these agencies and functions, together with the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works and its functions, and all of the Works Progress Administration and its functions (except the National Youth Administration and its functions), are hereby consolidated into one agency to be known as the Federal Works Agency, with a Federal Works Administrator at the head thereof. The Federal Works Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary at the rate of \$12,000 per annum. He shall have general direction and supervision over the administration of the several agencies consolidated into the Federal Works Agency by this section and shall be responsible for the coordination of their functions.

(b) The Federal Works Administrator shall appoint an Assistant Federal Works Administrator, who shall receive a salary at the rate of \$9,000 per annum, and he may also appoint such other personnel and make such expenditures as may be necessary.

(c) The Assistant Administrator shall act as Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, or in the event of a vacancy in that office, and shall perform such other duties as the Administrator shall direct.

(d) The several agencies and functions consolidated by this section in the Federal Works Agency shall carry with them their personnel.

SEC. 302. Public Roads Administration: (a) The Bureau of Public Roads and its functions shall be administered as the Public Roads Administration, at the head of which shall be the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, whose title shall be changed to Commissioner of Public Roads. Hereafter the Commissioner of Public Roads shall be appointed by the Federal Works Administrator.

(b) All functions of the Secretary of Agriculture relating to the administration of the Bureau of Public Roads are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercised by, the Federal Works Administrator.

SEC. 303. Public Buildings Administration: (a) The Public Buildings Branch of the Procurement Division and its functions, the Branch of Buildings Management of the National Park Service and its functions (except those relating to monuments and memorials), and the functions of the National Park Service in the District of Columbia in connection with the general assignment of space, the selection of sites for public buildings, and the determination of the priority in which the construction or enlargement of public buildings shall be undertaken, are hereby consolidated and shall be administered as the Public Buildings Administration, with a

Commissioner of Public Buildings at the head thereof. The Commissioner of Public Buildings shall be appointed by the Federal Works Administrator and shall receive a salary at the rate of \$9,000 per annum. The Commissioner of Public Buildings shall act under the direction and supervision of the Federal Works Administrator.

(b) All functions of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of Procurement relating to the administration of the Public Buildings Branch of the Procurement Division and to the selection of location and sites for public buildings, and all functions of the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the National Park Service relating to the administration of the functions of the Branch of Buildings Management and the functions of the National Park Service in the District of Columbia in connection with the general assignment of space, the selection of sites for public buildings, and the determination of the priority in which the construction or enlargement of public buildings shall be undertaken, are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercised by, the Federal Works Administrator.

SEC. 304. United States Housing Authority: (a) The United States Housing Authority and its functions shall be administered by the United States Housing Administrator under the direction and supervision of the Federal Works Administrator.

(b) All functions of the Secretary of the Interior relating to the administration of the United States Housing Authority are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercised by, the Federal Works Administrator.

SEC. 305. Public Works Administration: The Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works and its functions shall be administered as the Public Works Administration with a Commissioner of Public Works as the head thereof. The Commissioner of Public Works shall be appointed by the Federal Works Administrator and shall receive a salary at the rate of \$10,000 per annum. The Commissioner of Public Works shall act under the direction and supervision of the Federal Works Administrator.

SEC. 306. Work Projects Administration: The Works Progress Administration and its functions (except the National Youth Administration and its functions) shall be administered as the Work Projects Administration, with a Commissioner of Work Projects at the head thereof. The Commissioner shall be appointed by the Federal Works Administrator and shall receive a salary at the rate of \$10,000 per annum. The Commissioner shall act under the direction and supervision of the Federal Works Administrator.

SEC. 307. Transfer of records and property: All records and property (including office equipment) of the several agencies which, with their functions, are consolidated by section 301 into the Federal Works Agency are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Works Agency for use in the administration of the agencies and functions consolidated by that section.

SEC. 308. Transfer of funds: (a) So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940) for the use of any agency (except the United States Housing Authority) in the exercise of any functions transferred by this part, or for the use of the head of any department or agency in the exercise of any functions so transferred, and so much of such balances available to the United States Housing Authority for administrative expenses, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, shall be transferred for use in connection with the exercise of the functions transferred by this part. In determining the amount to be transferred the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer: *Provided*, That the use of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds transferred by this section shall be subject to the provisions of section 4 (d) (3) and section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

(b) All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940) for the use of the United States Housing Authority, other than those transferred by subsection (a) of this section, are hereby transferred with the United States Housing Authority and shall remain available to it for the exercise of its functions.

SEC. 309. Administrative funds: The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall allocate to the Federal Works Agency, from appropriations, allocations, or other funds available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940) for the administrative expenses of the agencies and functions consolidated by section 301, such sums, and in such proportions, as he may find necessary for the administrative expenses of the Federal Works Agency.

SEC. 310. Personnel: Any of the personnel transferred by this part found to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the efficient administration of the functions transferred by this part shall be retransferred under existing law to other positions in the Government service or separated from the service subject to the provisions of section 10 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

PART 4. LENDING AGENCIES

SECTION 401. (a) Transfers to the Department of Agriculture: The Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, and their functions and activities, together with their respective personnel, records, and property (including office equipment), are hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture and shall be administered in such Department under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be responsible for the coordination of their functions and activities.

(b) Transfer of administrative funds: So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940) for the administrative expenses of any agency transferred by this section, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, shall be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture for such use; and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall allocate to the Secretary of Agriculture from such funds, such sums, and in such proportions as he may find necessary for the administrative expenses of the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the agencies and functions transferred by this section. In determining the amount to be transferred the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer. The use of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds transferred by this subsection shall be subject to the provision of section 4 (d) (3) and section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

(c) Transfer of other funds: All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds, other than those mentioned in subsection (b) of this section, available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940) for any agency transferred by subsection (a) of this section shall be transferred with such agency and shall remain available to it for the exercise of its functions.

(d) Personnel: Any of the personnel transferred by this section to the Department of Agriculture which the Secretary of Agriculture shall find to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the administration of the functions transferred by this section shall be retransferred under existing law to other positions in the Government or separated from the service subject to the provisions of section 10 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

Sec. 402. (a) Federal Loan Agency: There shall be at the seat of the Government a Federal Loan Agency, with a Federal Loan Administrator at the head thereof. The Federal Loan Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary at the rate of \$12,000 per annum.

(b) Assistant Federal Loan Administrator: The Federal Loan Administrator shall appoint an Assistant Federal Loan Administrator, who shall receive a salary at the rate of \$9,000 per annum. The Assistant Administrator shall act as Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in that office, and shall perform such other duties as the Administrator shall direct.

(c) Powers and duties of Administrator: The Administrator shall supervise the administration, and shall be responsible for the coordination of the functions and activities of the following agencies: Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Electric Home and Farm Authority, RFC Mortgage Co., Disaster Loan Corporation, Federal National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Federal Housing Administration, and Export-Import Bank of Washington. The Administrator may appoint such officers and employees and make such expenditures as may be necessary.

(d) Administrative funds: The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall allocate to the Federal Loan Agency from appropriations, allocations, or other funds available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940) for the administrative expenses of the agencies named in this section, such sums, and in such proportion as he may find necessary for the administrative expenses of the Federal Loan Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message and the accompanying document will be referred to the Select Committee on Government Organization.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's reorganization message and the accompanying document be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COAST GUARD RESERVE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Coast Guard Reserve to be composed of owners of motorboats and yachts, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

FEBRUARY 1939 REPORT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for the month of February 1939, together with a statement of loan and other authorizations made during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Detroit Unit, Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against amendment of the National Labor Relations Act until experience under the operation of the act shall indicate the need for changes, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Police Jury Association of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La., protesting against any change in the present activities or set-up of the National Youth Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry farmers of Sumner County, Kans., praying for the repeal of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of the Sixth District Townsend Organization, of Beloit, Kans., praying for the enactment of House bill 2, a general-welfare bill granting old-age assistance, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WALSH presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts praying for the enactment of legislation to insure the neutrality of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the following resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolutions memorializing Congress in favor of legislation increasing the amounts of old-age assistance payable by the Federal Government to States and their political subdivisions

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to amend title I of the Social Security Act so as to provide that States and their political subdivisions, which grant old-age assistance over and above the amount entitling them to receive from the Federal Government the maximum partial reimbursement now provided by said title I, be reimbursed in full by the Federal Government for so much of such excess as does not exceed a certain limit to be fixed by said Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth forthwith forward copies of these resolutions to the Presiding Officers of both branches of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the amounts of old-age assistance payable by the Government to States and their political subdivisions, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. WALSH.)

RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF TENNESSEE—DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of Tennessee, memorializing the Federal Congress to enact adequate legislation providing for the speedy deportation of all alien residents who do not signify their willingness, desire, and intention to become citizens of the United States within a reasonable time after entry into the United States of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution presented by the Senator from Tennessee will be received, printed under the rule in the RECORD, and properly referred.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Immigration, as follows:

Senate Resolution 15

Resolution memorializing the Federal Congress to enact adequate legislation providing for speedy deportation of all alien residents who do not signify their willingness, desire, and intention to become citizens of the United States within a reasonable time after entry into the United States of America

Whereas it is estimated that there are approximately 8,000,000 residents within the boundaries of the United States of America,

who have neither become naturalized nor filed any declaration of intention to become citizens of this Nation; and

Whereas this large group of alien residents provide a fertile field for agitators and organizations who are not in sympathy with the American form of government; and

Whereas it is the sense of the State Senate of the State of Tennessee, that this large group of alien residents should not be permitted to enjoy the freedom and privileges of this Nation without assuming the corresponding duties and obligations of citizenship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Tennessee, That the Federal Congress be, and it is hereby requested to direct its attention to this condition and to enact adequate legislation which will provide for speedy deportation of all alien residents of this country, who do not within a reasonable time signify their willingness, desire, and intention, and qualify, to assume the obligations of citizenship and become citizens of this United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the State be, and he is hereby directed to transmit properly authenticated copies of this resolution to each member of the Tennessee congressional delegation and to each of the United States Senators from Tennessee.

LOW-COST HOUSING

Mr. WAGNER presented a communication embodying a resolution of the Commissioners of the Housing Authority of the City of El Paso, Tex., which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF EL PASO, TEX.,
El Paso, Tex., April 17, 1939.

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,

Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: At a meeting of the commissioners of the Housing Authority of the City of El Paso, Tex., held on April 13, 1939, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER a bill which, if enacted, will amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, which is bill S. 591; and

"Whereas this bill will provide funds to permit a normal continuity for the program of slum clearance and low-rent housing; and

"Whereas it is desirous that the local authority record its approval of the amendment to the Housing Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Housing Authority of the City of El Paso, Tex., That in the interest of the avowed purposes of the slum clearance and low-rent housing program of the United States, this authority urge the Congress to approve of Senator WAGNER's bill; and

"That the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and the House Committee on Banking and Currency be urged to favorably report the bill out of committee."

A copy of this resolution has been forwarded to Senators TOM CONNALLY, MORRIS SHEPPARD, DAVID I. WALSH, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, JOSH LEE, JAMES J. DAVIS, and ROBERT A. TAFT, and to Representatives WRIGHT PATMAN and R. E. THOMASON, all of whom have been urged to give the bill their favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,

A. B. SWAIN,
Executive Director and Secretary.

CAPITAL STRUCTURE OF RAILROADS

Mr. WAGNER presented a communication embodying a resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Port Henry, N. Y., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Port Henry, N. Y., April 20, 1939.

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WAGNER: At a regular meeting of the Port Henry Chamber of Commerce, held April 14, 1939, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the chamber that the so-called Chandler bill, H. R. 5407, contemplating the simplified method for a railroad to make readjustments in its capital structure provided it can secure the consent of 75 percent of the creditors, and which is commonly known as the voluntary adjustment bill; and

"Whereas we understand that this bill has been favorably reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary and is now on the calendar of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this chamber go on record as favoring the adoption of this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Members of Congress urging them to support this bill on the grounds that it is not a controversial matter and would, we believe, be very helpful to certain railroad companies."

Respectfully submitted this 20th day of April 1939.

PORT HENRY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
C. A. ANDERSON, *Treasurer.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HARRISON (for Mr. BYRD), from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5287) relating to the importation of distilled spirits for consumption at the New York World's Fair, 1939, and the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939, and to duties on certain articles to be exhibited at the New York World's Fair, 1939, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 324) thereon.

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 2017) to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 325) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 2233. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind," approved March 3, 1931; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2234. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Maguire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2235. A bill for the relief of Sacred Heart Hospital; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2236. A bill for the relief of Benjamin F. Longenecker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2237. A bill to amend the Taylor Grazing Act; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2238. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make an investigation with respect to the claims against the United States of certain Indians of the Chiricahua Apache Tribe; and

S. 2239 (by request). A bill for the relief of Dorothy Clair, G. F. Allen, and Earl Wooldridge; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 2240. A bill to provide for a national census of housing (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the foregoing bill printed in full elsewhere in the proceedings.)

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 2241. A bill granting an increase of pension to Margaret D. Cole (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. McKellar introduced Senate bill 2242, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 2243. A bill for the relief of Virgil Kuehl, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2244. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept real estate devised to the United States by the late Lizzie Beck, of Mena, Ark., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

CENSUS OF HOUSING

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a national census of housing, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD, together with an accompanying letter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter presented by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2240) to provide for a national census of housing was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to provide information concerning the number, character, and geographical distribution of dwelling

structures and dwelling units in the United States and concerning the social and economic characteristics of their ownership and use, necessary to aid in the formulation of a national housing program and in the administration of housing legislation, the Director of the Census shall take a census of housing in each State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska in the year 1940 and every 5 years thereafter, and shall be authorized to make such supplementary studies (either in advance of or after the taking of such censuses) as are necessary to the completion thereof. The census of housing to be taken in the year 1940 shall be taken in conjunction with the population inquiry of the Sixteenth Decennial Census. Each census of housing shall relate as closely as possible to the day and month provided by law for the population census.

Sec. 2. All of the provisions, including penalties, of the act providing for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21; U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 13, ch. 4), shall apply to the taking of the census provided for in section 1 of this act.

Sec. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act during the Sixteenth Decennial Census period there is authorized to be appropriated, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum sufficient to cover the estimated cost of such census.

The accompanying letter presented by Mr. WAGNER is as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1939.

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: In connection with the various housing programs in which the Federal Government participates, there has developed a pressing need for reliable information on all phases of housing conditions in the United States. To insure the most economical, efficient, and intelligent development of our housing and home-building programs, it is essential that a complete housing census be undertaken at the earliest possible date. If such a housing census were to yield information most valuable from the standpoint of economic and social planning, it should be taken simultaneously and in conjunction with the census of population in 1940.

It is my hope that you will agree with this view of the American Federation of Labor and will deem it possible and desirable to introduce legislation authorizing a complete housing census and providing the necessary appropriation therefor.

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bridge bill creating the Memphis and Little Rock Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn., and for other purposes.

This bridge is badly needed across the great Mississippi at Memphis, and I express a hope that the Congress may speedily pass it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill of the Senator from Tennessee will be received and properly referred.

The bill (S. 2242) creating the Memphis and Little Rock Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 5488. An act to provide for the widening of Wisconsin Avenue in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5679. An act to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to fees of the United States marshal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. GEORGE, the Committee on Finance was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1077) for the relief of Victor S. Banks, and it was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5269, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, 1940, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, \$150,000,000. Such sum shall be immediately available and shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, other appropriations made by such section or for the purpose of such section: *Provided*, That not in excess of 25 percent of the funds herein made available may be devoted to any one agricultural commodity. So much of such funds as may be devoted to encouraging the exportation of cotton or cotton articles, and any other funds which may be available or may hereafter be made available for the purpose of encouraging the exportation of cotton or cotton articles, shall be expended in accordance with the provisions of the following new section which is hereby added to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended:

"Sec. 23. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make payments in kind or in money to any person who exports any raw cotton or articles manufactured in whole or in part from cotton, at such rates and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture determines are necessary in order that the cotton, or the cotton content in cotton articles, so exported shall be fully competitive in the world markets: *Provided*, That such payments shall be discontinued during any marketing year when exports of cotton from the United States during such marketing year equal the average of the exports from the United States during the 10-year period ending July 31, 1932. Such payments on raw cotton are authorized to be made only upon cotton bought in the open market, except that payments may be made upon cotton released from loans made or made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation when cotton of suitable classes and quantities to fill cotton export requirements is not available in the markets of the United States. The Secretary is authorized to decide when such free cotton is not so available; but no such payments shall be made, and no obligation to make such payments shall be incurred, prior to January 1, 1940, with respect to any cotton on which a loan has been made or made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation, nor shall such payments be made or obligations incurred during the period from August 1 to December 31, both inclusive, in any marketing year with respect to any cotton on which any such loan has been made.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, upon application by the owner, or his assignee, of cotton held under loans made or made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide for the release to such owner, or his assignee, of any or all of the cotton of such owner, or assignee, during any marketing year, except during the period from August 1 to December 31, both inclusive, if the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the release of cotton held under such loans (1) is needed to supply suitable classes and quantities of cotton to meet the operating requirements of mills in the United States and is not available in the markets of the United States, or (2) is needed to supply suitable classes and quantities of cotton to meet export requirements and is not available in the markets of the United States. Such cotton shall be released at a cost to the owner, or his assignee, equal to the current loan rate, plus (1) interest, insurance, and storage, for the period beginning at the average time when cotton was put into the current loan and ending at the end of the month when the cotton is released from the loan, and (2) one-fourth cent per pound for miscellaneous charges.

"(c) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire and to make available to him such cotton as may be necessary to make payments in kind authorized by this section. The funds now and hereafter made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation are hereby made available to such Corporation to acquire and make available to the Secretary of Agriculture such cotton as may be necessary to make the payments in kind authorized under this section, and to provide for the release of cotton under this section. The funds now or hereafter made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of encouraging the exportation of cotton or cotton articles, including, but not limited to, the funds now or hereafter made available by, or for carrying out the purposes of, this title, section 32, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935, as amended, and sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, are hereby made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for payments authorized in this section, and for administrative expenses in accordance with the applicable provisions of this title. The determinations of the Secretary of Agriculture made pursuant to the provisions of this section and

the facts constituting the basis for any payment when officially determined in conformity with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be final and conclusive."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4630) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 27, 32, and 35.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, and 29, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "thirteen thousand one hundred and six"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in the matter inserted by said amendment insert "\$36,017,416"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,185,834"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,750,087"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$170,371,405"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,927,020"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$15,525,061"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,896,937"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "and of the total of such amount \$500,000 shall be available exclusively for defraying the cost of increasing the strength of the National Guard above approximately two hundred and five thousand officers and men,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,964,544"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,
JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Jr.,
STYLES BRIDGES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
D. D. TERRY,
JOE STARNES,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
JOHN H. KERR,
D. LANE POWERS,
CHESTER C. BOLTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT NATIONAL PAROLE CONFERENCE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States to the National Parole Conference at the White House on April 17, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEAR AND FORCE, OR FACTS?—ARTICLE BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Senator O'MAHONEY, published in Dun's Review for April 1939, entitled "Fear and Force, or Facts?" which appears in the Appendix.]

COLUMNISTS AND CALUMNISTS—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes before the Newspaper Guild of New York City on Tuesday, April 11, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

A NONPARTISAN TARIFF PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY LYNN R. EDMISTER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Lynn R. Edminster, special assistant to the Secretary of State, before the League of Women Voters of Minneapolis on April 20, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR DUAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY FRED BRECKMAN

[Mr. BURKE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Our Dual System of Government," delivered by Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPEAL OF SILVER PURCHASE ACT OF 1934

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials dealing with the subject of the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, which appear in the Appendix.]

"WASHINGTON JITTERS"—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK POST

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Post of Thursday, April 20, 1939, entitled "Washington Jitters," which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN EUROPE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on April 21, 1939, at Princeton University, on conditions in continental and eastern Europe, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMISSION OF GERMAN REFUGEE CHILDREN TO THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson entitled "The Wagner-Rogers Bill," published in the Washington Post of April 24, 1939, an editorial from the New York Sun of April 20, 1939, entitled "Proposal to Lift Quota on 10,000 German Children Yearly Is Analyzed," an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Wednesday, April 19, 1939, entitled "Should 20,000 Children Be Admitted," an editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Ledger of April 22, 1939, entitled "A Plea for Children," an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of April 25, entitled "20,000 Homeless Children at the Door," and an editorial from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, La., headed "Asylum for Child Refugees," which appear in the Appendix.]

EUROPE AND AMERICA

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, in my opinion there could be nothing more helpful to the people of the United States than a careful study of American history from 1914 to 1919. We undertook at that time to pursue a course which we thought was a course of peace, and we found it was the path of war. It is my opinion that we should carefully reconsider the entire story from 1914 to 1919, for therein we find much advice which we ought to follow at this time.

An editorial entitled "Again" is published in the Saturday Evening Post of April 22. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks, but before that is done I desire to read a paragraph which gives the illustration I had in mind in my opening remarks:

Again the fires of revenge are lighted. Again the tracings of scar tissue on the map of Europe are tumescent and red. The aggressor is loose and heavily armed—more heavily than ever before, thanks to not having paid his American debts. The non-aggressors also are heavily armed—more heavily than ever before, thanks to not having paid their American debts—and yet, as they think, not heavily enough. Again France and England are calling to America for help. To help them? No, no. To help them save for mankind the priceless legacy that is Europe.

I ask that the editorial from the Saturday Evening Post may be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of April 22, 1939]

AGAIN

It was the righteous-warrior dream. We would go to war to end war. Where? On another continent—where, since the beginning of historic time, there had been only interludes of peace.

We would make the world safe for democracy. Where? In Europe—where the only relation of the individual to the state that has ever been understood, or perhaps ever will be, is that of subject.

We would establish the divine right of political self-determination for minorities. Where? In that Old World—where the symbol of a minority is a broken sword, where every racial fragment burns on its altar the incense of revenge, where there is no boundary between nations but it is a trace of scar tissue.

The romantic theme of the dream was to say that we had no quarrel with any people, certainly none with the German people. Indeed, if they would only hear us they would know that we were not at war with them.

It was for their own good that we were going to destroy the war lords that had made them to go forth against their will to kill other gentle and peace-loving people.

So we took part with England and France and all who were fighting Germany. They did not understand what we were saying any more than the Germans did; but whatever it was, it was all right for the moment because it meant an American army in France and unlimited access to the United States Treasury, where they could cash their I O U's for billions; each government as it signed another one, being required only to promise that when the war was over it would take it up with an interest-bearing bond.

The war ended in what, for Europe, was another truce. Incredulous European ears heard us say that we would take nothing for ourselves, only a just and durable peace. Cynical European eyes watched the American Jehovah of Peace and his band of angels as they sat down in Paris to redraw the map of Europe in the zigzag lines of simple humanity and justice. Every line they drew would be another trace of scar tissue. They did not know that because they did not know Europe.

Between the dreaming peace bringers and the hard-eyed truce-makers lay 2,500 years of bloodstained history. The peace bringers were for wiping all of that out in the drawing. The truce makers knew better. They knew also how impermanent the drawing was. Having laid down for themselves the principal lines of the next war and then the lines stipulated for in their secret treaties, they were willing that the Americans should play with the fringe.

The fact was that the hard-eyed Europeans were deeply concerned about something else, a thing the Americans would not understand. For once and for the first time, they faced the fact that the ancient and honorable business of war was bankrupt on its own premises. It had gone too far. The stakes had got too high. There was no profit in victory. Revenge, yes, advantage and territory; but no cash on the drumhead. They could charge it all to Germany in the customary manner, as Germany before had charged it to them, but this time that meant nothing at all, because it was more than Germany could pay.

The idea of making the Americans pay is supposed to have occurred first to the practical British mind. That does not matter. They had all discovered what a dream mine the United States Treasury was, and it may very easily have occurred to all of them at once in a spontaneous manner. When you are meditating desperately on money, you think, naturally, of where it is and who has it.

Anyhow, it became at once the controlling idea of Europe, uniting friend and foe. And, naturally, it was England's part, since she had the advantage of language, to lead the propaganda, which she did.

The propaganda was a symphony in two movements. The first movement was that the richest, most unselfish, most romantic people in the world—so rich they could afford to take the decisive part in a world war and want nothing material out of it—now owed it to themselves, to mankind, to civilization, to lend their wealth in a prodigal manner to rehabilitate this fallen Europe—a theme which the richest and most romantic people in the world

received with swelling pride. The second movement was that after having lent their wealth for that purpose, they would be a hateful, money-loving, Shylock people ever to want any of it back.

It was England that named the United States "Shylock."

It was England that struck hands with Germany and proposed to forego her share in German reparations and forgive her own war debtors, who would then forgive one another and Germany all around, if only the great rich Shylock Nation across the sea would forgive England her war debt to the United States Treasury.

It was the British Government, commanding the serpent's-tooth rhetoric of Lord Balfour and the insulting tongue of a Chancellor of the Exchequer, that called upon the world to witness that America, the Shylock, valuing gold more than blood, sacrifice, or friendship, was bleeding Europe white by exacting her pound of flesh in the name of war debts—at a time when the only money Europe was paying us on account of either the interest or principal of the war debts was money begrudgingly shaved from the proceeds of new American loans. Out of each new loan, so long as she could borrow, she paid a little on account of old loans, and that is the only kind of money we ever got back—a little of our own.

After we entered the war, in addition to the cost of our own exertions, represented by an Army of 2,000,000 men in Europe, the United States Treasury lent the several Allied Governments \$7,000,000,000 on their I O U's. For nearly 2 years after the armistice the United States Treasury continued to lend not to the same Allied Governments only but also to new Governments like Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Yugoslavia, until the competitive clamor for more, more became indecently brazen. When at last the United States Treasury slammed its doors in disgust, the amount owing to it by the governments of Europe on their promissory notes was more than eleven billions.

Germany meanwhile, running her colossal mark swindle, had discovered in Wall Street the world's first bottomless well of money-lending gullibility. Overnight Europe transferred her operations from the Americans' Public Treasury to their private purse.

The cost of money in Wall Street was but the cost of the engravers' art. The borrowers were no higglers. Upon bonds still wet from the printing press they were willing to write any rate of interest—6, 7, 8 percent. What difference did it make? The money would never be paid back.

Rehabilitation became a word of fantasy. We were lending Europe the money to rehabilitate her agriculture, her industry, her life. We had done better to throw it away, for not only did we lose it but the effect of it was to subsidize European industry in competition with our own, as we may see now in South America, besides subsidizing the start of her rearmament for the next war.

After Germany had purposely gone bankrupt to defraud her creditors, after the amazing mark swindle of which Americans were the principal alien victims, we lent her the money to set up a new Reichsbank on a gold basis. We lent her the money to make over her factories for mass production in the American example, to restore her railroads, to build schools, city halls, stadiums, highways, and playgrounds, and to clear her city slums. More than that—incredibly more—we lent her the money to pay her reparations to the victors. All the German reparations that were ever paid were paid with American money. France got most of it because she was the principal beneficiary of reparations; she used it partly to reconstruct her devastated areas and partly to pay something on her war debts to England.

An American traveler in Europe at this time might have pointed with pride to almost anything that glittered in the sun and said, "See, an American loan!" If he was from Peoria or Ottumwa, his bank in Peoria or Ottumwa had some of the bonds that did it, and the world was a wonderful place.

Meanwhile, those I O U's for eleven billions in the United States Treasury were all unacknowledged and fading. But by this time the infatuation was such that many Americans were themselves supporting the European thesis that we could well afford to forget the war debts and go on with the great work of rehabilitation. Was it not that work that was keeping our factories busy? It was. There was no limit to the amount of goods Europe would buy, so long as we lent her the money to buy them with. In the end they would cost her nothing.

The United States Treasury thought differently. It thought the European governments ought at least to acknowledge their war debts and agree to pay what they could afford to pay. This they both pleasantly and unpleasantly declined to do.

The time came when Great Britain was eager to put the pound sterling back on a gold basis, and this she dared not try to do with the United States Treasury holding her overdue note of hand for five billions. In this dilemma, and with very bad grace, never for one moment suspending her propaganda for cancellation, she came one day to the United States Treasury and gave a bond for her I O U's, as she had promised to do—not a bond in full, but for 80 cents on the dollar—and on her way home she stopped in Wall Street and borrowed \$300,000,000 gold for the Bank of England. When she got home she began calling us "Shylock" again.

No other war debtor remembered its I O U's at the United States Treasury until the American Government announced the policy that any of them on their way to Wall Street to borrow more money from the American purse would have to stop first in Washington and in some way acknowledge their war debts. Then France came and gave a bond for her I O U's at about 50 cents on the dollar, Italy a bond for hers at about 25 cents on the dollar, and so on; and all

of them, on their way home, stopped in Wall Street and got their hands deeper into the private American purse.

So it was that, besides lending Europe money for every other conceivable purpose, we lent her the money to pay all that she ever did pay on account of her war debts to the United States Treasury. When at last she had borrowed the American purse empty, and every big and little American banks' investment portfolio was stuffed with her bonds, she stopped paying anything. That was of all Europe, save only for one little honorable state named Finland.

Between cause and effect there was no decent delay. As soon as the stream of American loans stopped Germany purposely went bankrupt again, the payment of war reparations stopped, our European war debtors treated their bonds in the United States Treasury with satire, and in American banks from Maine to California foreign securities were tied up in bundles like old newspapers and kicked into the cellar.

To save less than \$200,000,000 a year Great Britain dishonored her bond at the United States Treasury. How many times that sum does she spend on new armament?

For \$125,000,000 a year France dishonored her bond at the United States Treasury. Yet now she can find the cash to buy a fleet of bombing planes in the United States.

The value of Italy's word is known. It is worth less than \$20,000,000 a year.

Germany's word was not worth writing.

British word, French word, Nazi or Fascist—which will you take on a bond? If you will not take it on a bond, what will you take it for? On a treaty, perhaps.

The idea that united them worked. Victor and vanquished together, they made the Americans pay.

Item, the cost of our own military exertions in the World War; item, the war and postarmistice loans made to the governments of Europe by the United States Treasury; item, the loss on European loans made from the private American purse; item, accrued interest—add it all up and it comes to this: That our passion to save Europe has already cost us more than \$50,000,000,000.

What have we learned? The righteous warrior dream now is 22 years old and we are still asleep.

Again the fires of revenge are lighted. Again the tracings of scar tissue on the map of Europe are tumescent and red. The aggressor is loose and heavily armed—more heavily than ever before, thanks to not having paid his American debts. The non-aggressors also are heavily armed—more heavily than ever before, thanks to not having paid their American debts—and yet, as they think, not heavily enough. Again France and England are calling to America for help. To help them? No, no. To help them save for mankind the priceless legacy that is Europe.

Well, what more shall be again?

ONE HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF ROSWELL K. COLCORD

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on this the 25th day of April, there is in the State of Nevada celebrating his one hundredth birthday, a citizen who was born in the glorious State of Maine, but who in his early years went forward to follow the setting sun into the Golden West. He has rounded out a great career in the silver State of Nevada, where his lifetime has been spent, and where he has given some of the most valuable advice and leadership that any man of the West has ever given. He was Governor of the State of Nevada and gave to that great State and to its people one of the finest administrations that America has ever known from a Governor's chair.

Today is the one hundredth anniversary of his birth. Today, as he celebrates the one hundredth anniversary of his birth, the people of the State of Nevada are joining with him, that they may extend to him their heartfelt gratitude and congratulations. As he walks the streets of the capital city of Nevada every human being there respects, admires, and reveres him. Over 110,000 square miles of the great State which gave the West so much of history, the name of Roswell K. Colcord is revered as a native of the State of Maine who went to the West to make the West what it is, the savior of the Nation—the greatest territory in all the world, and the place where in the days to come humanity and civilization will find its greatest center.

Mr. President, on the anniversary of the birth of that great man, Roswell K. Colcord, former Governor of Nevada, I ask that the Senate receive and immediately consider a resolution which I submit on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). Without objection, the resolution will be received. Is there objection to its present consideration?

LXXXIV—299

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 128) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Whereas Roswell K. Colcord, born in North Searsport, Maine, emigrated to the West in the year 1857 and there engaged in silver mining, became Governor of the State of Nevada in 1890, and later director of the United States Mint in Carson City, Nev.; and Whereas the said Roswell K. Colcord becomes 100 years of age on this the 25th day of April 1939: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States, noting with gratification the high standard of character maintained throughout his long life and the high quality of public service rendered by him, extends to him heartiest congratulations and the cordial good wishes of all its Members.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Routine morning business having been concluded, the calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the calendar begin with calendar No. 325, House bill 2098, inasmuch as all previous bills on the calendar were called last Thursday.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask the majority leader if he would be willing to amend his request so as to revert to Calendar No. 208, Senate Joint Resolution 11, and let the joint resolution come up for the purpose of making a motion to proceed to consider it?

Mr. BARKLEY. I had in mind that immediately following the call of the calendar the Senator could move to take up the joint resolution. I think that would be a better course than to try to pass the joint resolution on the call of the calendar. I have conferred with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], as has the Senator from Vermont, and that course is entirely agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none; and the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar under rule VIII, beginning with calendar No. 325, House bill 2098.

BLOCK BOOKING AND BLIND SELLING—MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE PLACED ON TABLE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, Senate bill 280, to prohibit and to prevent the trade practices known as compulsory block booking and blind selling in the leasing of motion-picture films in interstate and foreign commerce, was introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. The subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, before which the bill has been pending, has held hearings and is considering the proposed legislation. In order that the motion to discharge the Committee on Interstate Commerce from the further consideration of the bill may not be called every time we have a morning hour, I ask unanimous consent that the motion go to the table calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed with the call of the calendar.

KATHERINE PATTERSON

The bill (H. R. 2098) for the relief of Katherine Patterson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH N. THIELE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4133) for the relief of Joseph N. Thiele, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "section", to strike out "40" and insert "49", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Joseph N. Thiele, postmaster at Whitewater, Wis., with the sum of \$11,736.84, representing the amount of public funds and property lost in the burglary of the post office at Whitewater, Wis., on February 1, 1937, such loss having resulted from no fault or negligence on the part of said postmaster, as

determined by the Postmaster General under a provision in title 39, United States Code, section 49.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ROLAND HANSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1160) for the relief of Roland Hanson, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "\$5,687.75" and insert "\$500"; and in line 11, after the numerals "1937", to insert "and to Dr. E. A. Julien, of Turlock, Calif., the sum of \$200, in full satisfaction of his claim for professional services rendered said Roland Hanson", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Roland Hanson, a minor, of Turlock, Calif., the sum of \$500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages for injuries sustained by him as a result of being struck by a United States Army truck on Highway No. 99 in Turlock, Calif., on May 23, 1937, and to Dr. E. A. Julien, of Turlock, Calif., the sum of \$200, in full satisfaction of his claim for professional services rendered said Roland Hanson: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Roland Hanson, a minor; and Dr. E. A. Julien."

HUGH M'GUIRE

The bill (S. 765) for the relief of Hugh McGuire was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$600 to Hugh McGuire, of Turner, Mont., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the loss of his truck, such truck having been destroyed on December 5, 1936, by a fire which burned a garage at Turner, Mont., in which it was stored for the purpose of safeguarding its load, consisting of property used in connection with Resettlement Administration projects: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

ERNEST O. ROBINETTE ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 2061) for the relief of Ernest O. Robinette and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JUNIUS ALEXANDER

The bill (H. R. 2074) for the relief of Junius Alexander was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIM OF E. DEVLIN, INC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2126) authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to adjust and settle the claim of E. Devlin, Inc.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of the bill.

Mr. LOGAN. I will say to the Senator from Utah that the case is rather unusual, and he is fully justified in asking for an explanation.

The bill was recommended by the Acting Comptroller General. The firm of E. Devlin, Inc., had charge of the burial service and furnished the necessary attention and supplies for one who at the time was thought to be a soldier. He had been down on the Mexican border. I believe he had entered the Federal service. Upon examination he was found unfit, and received an honorable discharge. The Devlin Co. sent a telegram to the proper authorities in Washington asking whether or not he was qualified to receive burial as a veteran. There was an error in transmitting the telegram to the Devlin Co. The Veterans' Administration said he was not qualified, but the telegram was delivered saying that he was qualified. The Devlin Co. went ahead and did the work, for which there was a charge of only \$100. The Comptroller General sent the bill to the Congress and recommended that it be passed.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of E. Devlin, Inc., for its services and expenses incurred in connection with the preparation of the body and the interment of the late Wallace C. Marietta, and to allow in full and final settlement of such claim an amount not to exceed the sum of \$100. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for payment of the claim: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

ANNA H. ROSA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1448) for the relief of Anna H. Rosa, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after "\$30", to insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anna H. Rosa, of East Providence, R. I., the sum of \$30, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages to her automobile caused by snow falling from the roof of the customhouse at Providence, R. I.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. E. BOSTROM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1812) for the relief of A. E. Bostrom, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. E. Bostrom, of De Smet, S. Dak., the sum of \$309, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States on account of the loss of certain personal property which was destroyed by fire on January 23, 1935, at Onigum, Minn., while said claimant was temporarily employed by the Indian Service as a physician: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUNCREST ORCHARDS, INC.

The bill (S. 927) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Suncrest Orchards, Inc., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Suncrest Orchards, Inc., against the United States for damages for the alleged wrongful seizure of certain fruit shipped in interstate commerce during the year 1926.

Sec. 2. Such claim may be instituted at any time within 2 years after the passage of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings in any suit before the Court of Claims under this act, and appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code as amended.

BORG-WARNER CORPORATION

The bill (S. 755) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Borg-Warner Corporation was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the bill with respect to which the Senator from Utah has asked for an explanation does nothing more nor less than is indicated in the title on the calendar. The purpose of the bill is merely to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Borg-Warner Corporation.

As I understand, the Borg-Warner Corporation has its principal place of business in the city of Chicago. The claim has been pending for some time. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Utah that all the bill provides is the right to appear before the Court of Claims and present evidence as to whether or not the claim should be allowed.

Mr. KING. How much is the claim, and when did it arise?

Mr. LUCAS. Without referring to my files, I cannot tell the Senator from Utah the exact amount of the claim. I am unable to say when the claim arose without going to my office and obtaining the information from my files. If the Senator desires that information and wishes to have the bill go over, I have no objection. I shall be glad to furnish the information requested.

Mr. KING. I may say to the Senator that in many cases claims which are stale, many years of age, are resurrected, and it is said, "Well, let it go to the Court of Claims and let the Court of Claims pass upon it." Many of those claims are invalid.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad next week to furnish the information the Senator desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SIGVARD C. FORO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1092) for the relief of Sigvard C. Foro, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$4,722" and insert "\$3,621.75", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money appropriated or allocated for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to Sigvard C. Foro, of Duluth, Minn., the sum of \$3,621.75, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for personal injuries and property damages sustained by him when his car was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on Highway No. 61 at Palmer, Minn., on August 5, 1937: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be

deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1449) for the relief of Robert Stockman was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee requests an explanation of the bill.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

W. B. TUCKER ET AL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1372) for the relief of W. B. Tucker, Helen W. Tucker, Lonie Meadows, and Susie Meadows, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$11,511.05" and insert "\$3,511.05", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. B. Tucker the sum of \$3,511.05, to Helen W. Tucker the sum of \$1,475.70, to Lonie Meadows the sum of \$546.29, and to Susie Meadows the sum of \$1,192.68, all residents of Louisburg, N. C., in full settlement of any and all claims for personal injuries, medical expenses, and property damage suffered by them as a result of an automobile accident which occurred on North Carolina State Highway 56 on June 9, 1936, when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a truck owned by the United States Soil Conservation Service and operated by one John W. Prather, an employee of the Soil Conservation Service: *Provided,* That no part of amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4087) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, so as to confer on the commanding general, General Headquarters Air Force, the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by chiefs of branches, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let us have an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah requests an explanation.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

THE SENATE PRESS GALLERY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 117) to amend paragraph 2 of rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "radio", to insert "wire", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That paragraph 2 of rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended by striking out the last sentence of said paragraph 2 and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "They shall make such regulations respecting the reporters' galleries of the Senate, together with the adjoining rooms and facilities, as will confine their occupancy and use to bona fide reporters for daily newspapers, to bona fide reporters of news or press associations requiring telegraph service to their membership, and to bona fide reporters for daily news dissemination through radio, wire, wireless, and similar media of transmission. These regulations shall so provide for the use of such space and facilities as fairly to distribute their use to all such media of news dissemination."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I wish the Senator who sponsored or originally offered the resolution would explain it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, this resolution was offered at the request of a number of agencies that were desirous of having the regulations of the Senate changed so as to admit certain news disseminating agencies to the press gallery. The present standing rule of the Senate places the authority for the adoption of the regulations concerning the press gallery in the Rules Committee, but with a very definite limitation that the use of the gallery must be confined to bona fide reporters gathering news for daily newspapers. There is no authority to open the galleries to press associations, such as the Associated Press, the United Press, and the representatives of other press associations nor to the representatives of radio agencies which gather news for daily dissemination. In order to enable the Rules Committee to consider a change in the regulations it was necessary, in the opinion of the Rules Committee, to amend the standing rule so as to provide, as will be done if the resolution shall be adopted, that the Rules Committee may make regulations concerning the press gallery, with the limitation that it must be confined to reporters gathering news for daily dissemination to newspapers, to reporters gathering news for press associations, and to reporters gathering daily news not for comment but for dissemination through radio, wireless, and other facilities.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Do I understand correctly the Senator to say that under the present rule the Associated Press and other press associations cannot have representatives in the press gallery?

Mr. GILLETTE. They do have.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; they do have.

Mr. GILLETTE. I will say to the majority leader they have their representatives in the press gallery, but it is by sufferance.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who suffers—the Members of the Senate?

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not know who suffers from it, but the definite limitation of the rule at the present time is that the Rules Committee may make regulations for the use of the gallery, strictly limiting it to reporters representing daily newspapers not more than one seat to each newspaper.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator that if the news-gathering associations are not permitted really under the rule to be represented in the press gallery, the rule ought to be amended.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is the opinion of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. It had never been called to my attention that they were in the gallery by sufferance. Certainly they are entitled to the same consideration as are individual reporters for daily newspapers. As a matter of fact, many of them supply the bulk of the news from Washington to newspapers represented also by individual reporters.

Mr. GILLETTE. I will say to the Senator that I am sure there is no disposition on the part of anybody to take advantage of the press associations. That question arose with the application of the representatives of certain news-gathering and radio news-disseminating agencies. When the matter was considered by a subcommittee, it was found that it was advisable to amend the standing rule, and it was suggested at the same time that when the limitation was enlarged to include possibly radio representatives, we correct definitely the present defect in the rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the radio news commentators or reporters at certain hours during the day and night disseminate news that under the present situation they have to gather largely from newspapers which they read prior to their news reports—

Mr. GILLETTE. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whereas under the proposed amendment to the rule the Rules Committee can consider whether it will permit representatives of various radio news-gathering

services to occupy seats in the galleries as well as the newspaper reporters.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is a correct statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment suggested does not itself automatically dispose of the question at all?

Mr. GILLETTE. Not at all. It simply gives the Rules Committee the authority to take action if they think it is wise and desirable.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me, in view of the change in the news-gathering situation in the country and in the world, there is nothing improper not only in correcting the technical mistake which it seems to me must have been not intentional in barring the news-gathering associations such as the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News, and others, but at the same time giving the committee power to consider the matter of radio news reporters as well.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Can the Senator advise us whether or not the rule now permits reporters such as columnists who report and disseminate news entirely for their own gain and not for any particular paper, to use the facilities of the press gallery?

Mr. GILLETTE. The language of the present standing rule is that regulations may be made subject to the limitation that the use of gallery must be confined to reporters disseminating news for daily newspapers. It has been enlarged, as I have said, largely by sufferance and sometimes by action of the Rules Committee, regardless of that limitation. For instance, the Associated Press, I believe, at the present time has 75 members of the gallery. The standing rule limits the privilege to one reporter for each daily newspaper.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does it permit columnists who are selling or syndicating their columns to have the privileges of the press gallery?

Mr. GILLETTE. The present rule does not.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then by what authority have columnists been in the press gallery?

Mr. GILLETTE. I will say to the Senator that the committee has studied this matter for a number of weeks. It was almost impossible to find out how the situation had developed from 1834. One gentleman, a member of a press association, has painstakingly investigated it. We have consulted with the Parliamentarian. We could go back to the proceedings of the Rules Committee and find perhaps where they had taken some action about 1834. But the standing rule very definitely limits the privilege of the press gallery. There is a standing committee of correspondents that is set up and selected by the members of the press gallery, who have done a very wonderful work in connection with it. I might suggest to Senators that in the report of the committee is embodied a synopsis of the development of this whole situation, on which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and I collaborated, feeling that it was very important.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to ask the Senator one more question. Does the Rules Committee now contemplate, or has the question been discussed by the committee, that those who write syndicated articles and who are known generally as columnists may come under such amendment as may be proposed by the pending resolution?

Mr. GILLETTE. I cannot answer that question directly. So far as I know that matter was not discussed. The inception of the present rule was discussed in the committee as was the enlargement of the rule for the purpose of including radio representatives. Then the whole question developed and we thought it was necessary to amend the standing rule.

Mr. McCARRAN. I propound a last question. Having in mind that there are today columnists who are writing the

news and giving it out through syndicated articles, who are disseminating the news perhaps more widely and more intelligently than might be expected from the ordinary, everyday reporter, it seems to me that some consideration should be given them. While we are giving consideration to those who represent the radio and who speak through the radio, we should also give consideration to those who are in reality disseminating the news through syndicated columns in the various newspapers of the country.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator for the suggestion. I am sure the Rules Committee will consider it very carefully.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, my interest was aroused during the explanation of the resolution by a statement which I thought the Senator made concerning the proposed amendment, namely, that it would permit the representatives of various radio agencies to use the facilities of the press gallery, or at least permit the Rules Committee to pass on whether they should be represented in the press gallery, but I thought the Senator said something about a further restriction or limitation as to their gathering news without comment.

Mr. GILLETTE. No; I am sure the Senator misunderstood me. There was no intention on my part to suggest a restriction of comment. The proposed amendment simply places on the other agencies the limitation that the present rule places on the reporters for the daily newspapers.

Mr. HATCH. The same limitation would apply to all?

Mr. GILLETTE. The same limitation would apply to all.

Mr. HATCH. That is the point I desired to bring out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5324) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

J. J. GREENLEAF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 527) for the relief of J. J. Greenleaf, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "of all claims against" and insert "of the balance due from"; on line 7, after the name "Greenleaf", to insert "of Richmond, Ky."; on line 8, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "14,875"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "which", to strike out "employed" and insert "employment"; and at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and in full settlement of the balance due from the Government of the United States, to J. J. Greenleaf, of Richmond, Ky., the sum of \$14,875 for services rendered to the Government of the United States by J. J. Greenleaf pursuant to his employment to represent the Government of the United States in certain litigation, which employment is evidenced by a letter addressed to him by the Honorable Homer S. Cummings, the Attorney General of the United States, on August 9, 1935, which employment was enlarged by letter of August 23, 1935, addressed to him by George C. Sweeney, Assistant Attorney General: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I notice that the Attorney General recommends the passage of the bill with a reduced amount. That is a matter to which I should like to have the Senator from Kentucky address himself.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I am very glad to explain the bill. It was referred to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Brown] as a subcommittee. He went into it most extensively, held hearings, and reached the conclusion that the amount as carried in the bill was not sufficient to pay for the actual services which Mr. Greenleaf rendered.

I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that Mr. Greenleaf came to Washington because Mr. Woodson, of Kentucky, had been appointed Alien Property Custodian. Mr. Greenleaf did not care about coming, but Mr. Woodson wanted a friend to advise him. When that activity was transferred to the Department of Justice Mr. Greenleaf went with it for a while. He stayed on for a few months, when he resigned and went home, after he had made some effort to prepare the cases which he was afterward employed as a special Assistant Attorney General to look after. He received a letter from the Attorney General asking if he would conduct certain cases, known as the Cattle Tick cases, and he agreed to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator, that was after Mr. Greenleaf had received regular employment by the year.

Mr. LOGAN. Oh, yes. He resigned and went home. A judgment for \$600,000 was secured against the Government, and for 29 months Mr. Greenleaf gave practically all his time to the trial of these cases. There were 22 parties and 3 separate cases.

I thought, and the Senator from Michigan thought, that the amount Mr. Greenleaf should receive should be more than we are allowing him, because the Attorney General wrote to Mr. Greenleaf and said that after the services were over he would pay him a reasonable fee. Mr. Greenleaf filed an affidavit from the most outstanding lawyers in Kentucky, and perhaps from some other places, pointing out that a reasonable fee for the services rendered would be \$50,000 or \$60,000, but under a law enacted by Congress the Department cannot pay a special assistant more than at the rate of \$10,000 a year. Because of that law the Senator from Michigan reported to our committee that all Mr. Greenleaf could receive was about \$21,000, of which some \$7,000 had been paid; and the Senator from Michigan recommended to the committee, and we accepted the recommendation, that \$14,000 be appropriated, which is all we thought we could appropriate under the law.

I believe that substantially states the facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hatch in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF JOSEPH MIHELICH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 920) for the relief of Mary Mihelich, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Montana to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, upon the claim of the estate of Joseph Mihelich, for damages sustained as a result of the death of Joseph Mihelich, who was killed at Butte, Mont., on July 2, 1938, by the caving in of a sewer ditch which had been dug by employees of the Works Progress Administration: *Provided*, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed \$5,000.

Sec. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the

District of Montana to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of Joseph Mihelich."

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) for the relief of W. K. Richardson was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let us have an explanation of the joint resolution. Let it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

DOMICILIARY CARE, ETC., FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

The bill (H. R. 2320) to provide domiciliary care, medical and hospital treatment, and burial benefits to certain veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to persons entitled to domiciliary care, medical and hospital treatment, and burial benefits under the provisions of sections 6 and 17, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 706 and 717), and regulations issued pursuant thereto, as amended, those persons recognized as veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, under public laws in effect on March 19, 1933, are hereby included within the provisions of the aforesaid section 6, as amended, and the second proviso of the aforesaid section 17, and regulations issued pursuant thereto, as amended, in the same manner and to the same extent as the provisions are now or may hereafter be applied to veterans of any war as specified therein.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 190) to authorize the temporary appointment of a special judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over. That completes the calendar.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, AND AUTHORITY FOR TRANSACTION OF CERTAIN BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate shall conclude its business today it stand in adjournment until noon on Thursday next, and that during the interim the Vice President shall be authorized to sign bills and resolutions, that committees may report bills, resolutions, and nominations, and that the Secretary of the Senate may receive communications from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution No. 11, Calendar No. 208, directing the Comptroller General to readjust the account between the United States and the State of Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to audit the claim of the State of Vermont with respect to advances and expenditures made by such State for military purposes during the War of 1812-15, with Great Britain, and after applying the rules of evidence and settlement to this class of claims, provided for in resolution of May 14, 1836 (5 Stat. L. 132), and in section 12 of the act approved March 3, 1857 (11 Stat. L. 229), to submit to the Senate a report containing the results of an audit of such claim, in conformity with said rules, and to certify to Congress for an appropriation the balance found due the State of Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall not occupy the time of the Senate longer than to state, just prima facie, the purpose of the bill.

The bill provides for the adjustment of a claim by the State of Vermont against the United States, based upon ex-

penditures, and the interest on those expenditures, made for the United States in its national defense in the War of 1812-15.

The legal foundation for the claim is statutes passed by the Federal Government from 1814 to 1818 promising definitely and specifically to pay this type of claim. A part of the claim is noninterest bearing. That is to say, \$35,-057.78, as ascertained by the Comptroller General under a resolution formerly passed by the Senate, is noninterest bearing. The interest all arises over the amount of \$4,130 of a loan obtained by the State of Vermont, to carry which it paid interest, and which it reloaned or expended for the benefit of the United States Government.

As ascertained to the date of February 19, 1935, the sum of these items of principal and the interest thereon is \$92,-868.90. It makes me blush to think that I have had to ask the Senate time after time to consider this just and legal claim. It is so insignificant in amount as compared with the other claims that pass the Senate without any difficulty whatever that I really marvel at the idea that I am forced to put on pressure to have this claim allowed.

The bill itself does not allow the claim. It does not appropriate money for the payment of the claim. It makes an arrangement for the Comptroller General to bring the calculation up to date, and to have the authority to do so from the entire Congress, so that the Budget Bureau may consider the matter and the item may be put into an appropriation bill at some time in the future. We hope some day to have this just claim paid to the State of Vermont, and I now leave the matter for my kind friend from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] to state his objection, which heretofore has been repeatedly urged here.

I may say that similar bills have twice been referred to the Judiciary Committee and approved, and passed by the Senate, but they were held up in the House for lack of expedition in the consideration of bills on the calendar. A third time a bill for this purpose was referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and favorably reported, and then referred to the Committee on Claims. The Senator from Nebraska was chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill from that point of view, and reported unfavorably upon it. Now, for the fourth time, the measure has been favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will entirely satisfy himself today regarding the bill and that the Senate itself will pass it.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry of the Senator from Vermont. Does the direction to the Comptroller General to make an audit direct him to include advances which have been made to the State of Vermont by the Federal Government subsequent to that time? I mean, is there any direction to include what might be considered offsetting items?

Mr. AUSTIN. The direction is certainly ample to enable the Comptroller General to offset what legally ought to be offset against any claim. As a matter of fact, in the former calculation the Comptroller General offset certain sums of money that has been properly paid, and that ought to be offset. If there are any more such sums, let them be presented now. If the Senator from Colorado has anything to suggest that should be offset against this claim, let us hear from him now.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I had no suggestion to make. I was making an inquiry. I am merely conscious of the fact that in the case of Vermont and other States loans and advances have been made to the States for relief purposes within the last 6 or 8 years, and I was merely inquiring whether or not the joint resolution would provide for a general audit of the accounts of the States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, if the State of Vermont borrows any money from the United States, the United States will not have to offset it in order to get it. The State of Vermont has always paid its bills "on the nail," and the

State of Vermont expects the United States to pay it what the United States owes the State of Vermont. That is all it asks.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, there is a great deal more to the point raised by the Senator from Colorado than is disclosed by the laudatory remarks of the Senator from Vermont for his native State. The basis of the pending claim is that at a time 122 years ago the State of Vermont incurred some expenditures in performing what is considered a Federal function; that is, providing for national defense. This action occurred in the War of 1812. The State was defending itself, but under our theory the National Government bears the expense of such activities. Now, after the lapse of 122 years, the Senator from Vermont says that the money Vermont spent in defending itself, with interest on all items subject to interest, should be repaid; and considerably more than half of the total amount of the claim represents interest.

As I understand, the point raised by the Senator from Colorado is that particularly in the last few years—and we need not go back beyond that period—the Federal Government has been doing in Vermont and for Vermont citizens things which ought to be done by the State for itself, has been incurring expenditures in providing for relief, in making contributions toward the erection of public works in the State of a strictly local nature, and, I venture to say, without having checked the figures, that within the last 5 years the Federal Government has incurred expenditures for Vermont which ought to have been paid by Vermont itself, running as high as a hundred times the amount of the claim now presented. That, in a way, forms the basis of my objection to this type of legislation.

Beyond that, however, is the question of the age of the claim. According to the Comptroller General's report, in 1817 the State of Vermont loaned \$4,130, and in 1818, \$6,000. Those dates, however, the Comptroller points out, are merely supplied. The loans were in connection with the War of 1812, and the records do not show the exact dates, so he puts in those approximate dates.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understood the Senator from Nebraska to say that, in addition to the loans, some expenditures were made directly by the State for military purposes.

Mr. BURKE. There were actual military expenditures amounting to \$35,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Were those expenditures made for defensive measures? Was the State invaded? Or were the expenditures made for offensive measures, to aid general prosecution of the war? Is the Senator prepared to answer that question?

Mr. BURKE. The State of Vermont feared invasion from the North. The State incurred military expenditures as a part of the general program, but also to aid in protecting itself from invasion.

My main objection to the pending measure is that it reaches back into the musty past and brings forth a claim which might with some reason have been presented immediately following the War of 1812; but to bring it up at this time, in a new century, 122 years later, seems to me straining altogether too far the matter of burdens which should be put upon the Federal Government.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I inquire of the Senator from Nebraska whether it is not true that Vermont really deserves considerable credit for these actions, which evidenced its loyalty to the Union during the War of 1812, at a time when very responsible and high influences in a large section of New England were holding the Hartford convention, and threatening to secede and join Canada in a new government. I think the test of Vermont's loyalty was the expenditure of some of

its money, which is pretty good proof that she was loyal, and it seems to me that she deserves special credit for standing by the Union in 1812 and 1814, when there were disloyal elements in many sections of New England.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit—

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to thank the Senator from the Lone Star State for his recognition of a characteristic of his own great State. Vermont did not excel other States in patriotism and in loyalty; but Vermont was loyal, though she takes no special credit for that.

I want the Senator from Nebraska to have full opportunity to tell the Senate, if he knows it is so, that Vermont's delay in presenting this claim to the United States is not due to any laches on Vermont's part; it is due, in part, to the fact that not until 1921 did the Federal Government set up any agency or provide any means by which to get such a claim as this allowed by the Federal Government. Thereupon Vermont commenced the effort to have her claim allowed. I will not take the time of the Senator from Nebraska further, but I want the Senator from Texas to know that I appreciate his great courtesy to the State of Vermont.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I concede at this point that if the Senator from Vermont is to carry out the program of welcoming congratulatory messages from Texas and other States on the loyalty of Vermont 122 years ago, eventually there may be very few votes against the pending measure. [Laughter.] For myself, I think Vermont is entitled to credit for its loyalty, but not credit which can be measured in dollars and cents. I put the credit I give to Vermont upon a much higher plane than that. I also think that Vermont has been repaid manifold by being permitted to be a member of a union of free States during the century and a quarter that has elapsed since that unfortunate affair.

In answer to another point raised by the Senator from Vermont, that it was not until 1921 that the Federal Government set up an agency which would make it possible to examine into claims of this kind, I am sure the Senator from Vermont would not want the implication to be conveyed by his remarks that no claims of this general nature were submitted and paid prior to 1921. Such claims have been paid through all the years. It is true an agency was set up in 1921 which made it possible to determine such claims in a more orderly and scientific manner; but there was no reason whatever why in 1819, 1820, and every year down through the century and a quarter since the claim accrued, Vermont could not have presented this claim to Congress and asked for its allowance.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the pending claim does not stand alone. Allow this claim, and every Senator in this body will be obliged to consider whether his duty and obligation to his own State or city may not be such as to require him to bring forward claims running back even beyond the War of 1812. In fact, a measure is now pending before the Committee on Claims calling for the payment of about \$3,000,000 to claimants whose claims, if they have any, arose during the period 1793 to 1799. There is also pending, and on a number of occasions it has been passed by the Senate, but fortunately not by the House of Representatives, a bill for the settlement of a claim of the city of Baltimore for about \$200,000 because during the Civil War, when it was thought that a different outcome than that which occurred might take place at Gettysburg, and General Lee might be sweeping down on Washington, it was deemed advisable to throw up breastworks around the city of Baltimore. Baltimore did that, and paid the laborers who did the work, and Baltimore has had a claim pending at each session of the Congress for repayment of the amount expended, with interest.

I may say that the State of Connecticut has on some occasions, not, however, through the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], presented a claim also growing out of the War of 1812.

The city of New York has a very large claim, approximating a million dollars, I believe, for expenditures which it claims it incurred on behalf of the Federal Government during the Civil War.

I have no doubt that almost every community in the United States can unearth some kind of a claim which it could, with just as much reason, present. It seems to me the Senate ought now to establish as a hard and fast rule that it will not go back 120 years, or 50 years, or 25 years, but will impose a reasonable limitation under which any State or city or community which has a valid claim must present it within 5, or 6, or 10 years, at the most.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask the Senator from Nebraska if he stated that the State of Connecticut ever received an allowance on account of the War of 1812?

Mr. BURKE. Not to my knowledge; but a claim was presented at the last session of Congress, and reported adversely by the Committee on Claims, proposing to pay the State of Connecticut several hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. DANAHER. Was the claim presented in the Senate?

Mr. BURKE. The claim was presented in the Senate, and referred first to the Committee on the Judiciary, along with the claim of the State of Vermont and that of the city of Baltimore and that of the city of New York, and then the claims were, upon motion, taken away from the Committee on the Judiciary and referred to the Committee on Claims, and a subcommittee was appointed to study them all very carefully. The junior Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH], myself, and one other Senator were on that subcommittee. We studied the claim of the State of Connecticut and the other three claims and reported them adversely to the full Committee on Claims. The full committee sustained our report, and the claims were reported adversely to the Senate and stood upon the Senate calendar all during the remainder of the last session with the adverse report of the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DANAHER. Since the Senator has acquitted the senior Senator from Connecticut of having presented that claim, I take it the same statement will apply to the present junior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BURKE. The claim was presented by former Senator Loneragan in all good faith, just as I accord to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] the utmost of good faith in now presenting Vermont's claim. There is much to be said in favor of the position he takes. Congress has through all the years allowed a great many of these claims to different States, but the fact that what seems to be a wrong policy has been pursued in the past hardly affords justification now for continuing it indefinitely; indeed, I believe it was the Senator from Vermont who called my attention to the fact that my own State of Nebraska presented a claim to Congress for expenses incurred in the Indian wars, and I investigated that matter and found it was true. So far as the point I am making is concerned, however, it does not offer any obstacle to my course, because the claim was presented within 4 or 5 years, or 10 years at the utmost, from the time the expenditures were incurred, and was allowed and paid within that time.

So I say, Mr. President, that it would be a greatly mistaken policy now to go back into ancient history and give to these claimants, cities, States, and communities, the right to take these sums out of the already heavily overburdened Treasury of the United States. The Senator may say that the bill does not make any appropriation, but every Member of the Senate knows that it is the first step leading toward an appropriation that will surely follow. I have been unwilling that any of these matters should pass by unanimous consent. I think there should be a record vote. If the Senate in its wisdom shall decide that it is willing to put the

stamp of approval on such claims as this, I certainly have no objection; but I myself should want to go to the full length and suggest the absence of a quorum, and at least ask for a record vote before the matter is submitted, and I do now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman
Andrews	Donahey	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Ashurst	Downey	King	Russell
Austin	Ellender	La Follette	Schwartz
Bailey	Frazier	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	George	Lodge	Sheppard
Barbour	Gerry	Logan	Shipstead
Barkley	Gibson	Lucas	Slattery
Bilbo	Gillette	Lundeen	Smathers
Bone	Glass	McCarran	Taft
Borah	Green	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Guffey	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gurney	Maloney	Tobey
Burke	Hale	Mead	Townsend
Byrnes	Harrison	Miller	Truman
Capper	Hatch	Minton	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hayden	Murray	Wagner
Chavez	Herring	Norris	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Hill	Nye	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Holman	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Connally	Holt	Overton	
DanaHER	Hughes	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, there is only one subject about which I care to say anything further, and that is the subject of the claim of laches on the part of the State of Vermont.

Laches is something entirely different from limitations. I think no Member of this body would interpose the statute of limitations upon a debt as between two sovereign nations. Is any Senator willing to assert that the plea of limitation of time is good on the part of Germany or Great Britain as against our debt? Oh, no.

It must be admitted that the debt in question is a straight, honest debt owed by the United States to the State of Vermont, as to which there is no question about the consideration. It was money paid "on the nail" in time of trouble, partly in consideration of patriotism, to be sure, but also paid under Federal statutes promising repayment and interest thereon.

There might be something to the claim of laches on the part of the State if the State of Vermont had by its act misled the United States in any way, to the detriment of the United States, between the time of contracting the debt and the present time. What do the facts appear to be in this relationship? Following the rendering of the service and the payment of the money by the State of Vermont there was a long period when no special provision was made for establishing this claim or any other similar claim; and many such claims which were presented failed for lack of a suitable medium for the establishment of the claims or for lack of proper evidence to prove the claims.

It was not until 1836 that the Federal statute was passed enabling some of the creditors to present their claims. In 1836 a joint resolution was passed "to authorize the Secretary of War to receive additional evidence in support of the claims of Massachusetts and other States of the United States for disbursements, services, and so forth, during the late war," meaning the same war with which we are dealing—the War of 1812. In that resolution there was this concluding sentence—

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. There was a little confusion, and I did not hear the year when the joint resolution was passed. I was not certain whether it was 1836 or 1836.

Mr. AUSTIN. Eighteen hundred and thirty-six. The concluding sentence of the joint resolution is as follows:

And that in the settlement of claims of other States upon the United States for services, disbursements, and expenditures during the late war with Great Britain, the same kind of evidence, vouchers, and proof shall be received as is herein provided for in relation to the claim of Massachusetts, the validity of which shall be, in like manner, determined and acted upon by the Secretary of War.

At that time the State authorities had in contemplation the presentation of the claim by the State, and they began to collect vouchers and enter them in a book in order to preserve them of record. I understand that such a book was completed by the 7th of November 1856. That date is ascertained from a certificate in the book itself. The certificate is as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Montpelier, November 7, 1856.

I certify that the foregoing 137 pages of this book contain true copies, in dates and amounts of the original vouchers in this office, for payments made by this State for services in the War of A. D. 1812 with Great Britain; and that the aggregate as appears by this book has been compared with the preceding vouchers and is correct.

In testimony whereof I hereunto set my hand and the seal of this State, this 7th day of November A. D. 1856.

[SEAL]

CHARLES W. WILLARD,
Secretary of State.

In 1857 a fire occurred, and it was believed that all evidence of the claim by the State of Vermont against the United States was destroyed. I understand this book was found a long time afterward in the adjutant general's office. The book was discovered, or duplicate originals of the entries were found, many years afterward.

In 1921 Congress approved the so-called Budget Act, by which the General Accounting Office was set up, and provision was made for the presentation of these claims. Thereupon Vermont's claim began to be presented, and old records in the House, which I have seen, show that efforts were made forthwith, and from that time to this, with but little interruption, not caused by the State itself, to establish its claim. The State has tried to establish its claim, have it allowed, appropriated for, and paid.

Mr. President, I claim that even in a court of justice, where a litigant is held down to a legal basis for his right of recovery, Vermont could never, never be convicted of laches in respect to the presentation of its claim. The rules in a court of justice are more stringent than they ought to be in this court. This court ought to be a court of conscience, doing right as between two sovereigns, even though there might be some technical disability in the presentation of the claim or in the time of its presentation.

Let us see just what the courts hold to be laches. I read from page 7 of the report a citation which purports to be copied from a case involving a claim for interest by a State against the Federal Government:

Laches is not, like limitation, a mere matter of time but principally a question of the inequity of presenting the claim to be enforced, an inequity founded upon some change in the condition or relation of the property of the parties (*Gallagher v. Cadwell*, 145 U. S. R. 368). The doctrine is based upon grounds of public policy, which requires for the peace of society the discouragement of stale demands. It is most applicable where the difficulty of doing entire justice arises through the death of the principal participants in the transaction complained of, or of the witnesses, or by reason of the original transaction having become so obscured by time as to render the ascertainment of the exact facts impossible (*Hammond v. Hopkins*, 143 U. S. R. 224).

Mr. President, the joint resolution calls for the ascertainment of the exact facts. It provides for the submission of the claim of the State of Vermont to the Comptroller General for auditing, for the purpose of having the amount ascertained by the General Accounting Office, put into the Budget of another year, appropriated for, and paid.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say at the present time. I understand that the Senator from Nebraska has called for a yea-and-nay vote, and I join in that request.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, it seems to me beyond question that in this matter Vermont was acting on behalf of the Union, on behalf of its territorial integrity, and against a possible invasion. In reality, she was participating in the national defense. She feared invasion from Canada, not only an invasion of Vermont but an invasion also of the United States; and the Union, therefore, is in honor bound to reimburse her for what she expended in military activities on behalf of the United States.

Furthermore, Mr. President, a just debt remains a just debt, no matter how old, and it is well known that the statutes of limitations do not apply to sovereignty.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I first wish to express entire concurrence with one of the points made by the Senator from Vermont; namely, that the question should be determined as it would be determined in a court of conscience. It should not be treated upon the basis of strict legal rules. I would not, as a Member of the Senate, think that we should act upon the basis of the statute of limitations. There are certain elements of conscience, however, that lead me to an opposite conclusion.

I am somewhat amazed to find the claim presented on the ground of conscience, and especially when we take into consideration things which have happened during the past 6 or 8 years. Here is a claim based upon loans and upon services rendered during the War of 1812. There is no contention as to their validity; I do not assume that there is any question as to the amount; but, from the standpoint of conscience, 7 or 8 years ago when distress prevailed throughout this land, including the State of Vermont, one of the first things that was done was the passage of an act, sponsored by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La FOLLETTE] and the then Senator from Colorado, Mr. Costigan, appropriating \$300,000,000, which was loaned to the States. It was not given but was loaned to the States, allocated and apportioned to the States, to enable them to provide for their necessities, to enable them to defend themselves against the depression. Since then endless millions of dollars have been appropriated by the Federal Government to aid in carrying the relief burdens of all the States, including the great State of Vermont. So, if we are going to talk about conscience, there is an element of conscience in the consideration whether or not a State is justified, in its conscience, after receiving this help of recent years in vastly greater amounts than the total of its claim, to come to Congress and ask to have paid an old claim.

The Federal Government has built in Vermont, in Colorado, and elsewhere schoolhouses; it has built hospitals; it has built courthouses; it has built roads out of Federal moneys in order to assist in carrying the burdens which were primarily those of the State governments. I stood on the floor not many weeks ago and urged an appropriation of several million dollars to aid the New England States relieve themselves from the effects of a destructive hurricane. I think some \$5,000,000 was appropriated for their aid. That was done just as a matter of good conscience, the Federal Government making no claim because of the great aid and help it has rendered and the burdens it has carried. So I ask, Is this claim to be sustained upon the ground of good conscience?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I am always delighted with the philosophy and good sense of the able Senator from Colorado, but does he think that the amount of benefit payments by the Federal Government to the State should be considered an offset to claims of the kind now under consideration?

Mr. ADAMS. I am merely recalling one particular appropriation which was a loan. There was one appropriation of \$300,000,000 which was sent to the States as a loan. My recollection is that a subsequent appropriation of \$500,000,000 went partly as a loan and partly as a grant. Expenditures

since then have not been in the shape of loans. However, I was merely discussing the one question of good conscience as between two sovereignties and whether or not one should exact the letter of the bond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution be engrossed and read a third time?

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. BURKE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass? [Putting the question.] By the sound, the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. BURKE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the joint resolution was passed.

THE NEUTRALITY ENTANGLEMENT

Mr. NYE obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield to me for a few observations?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate has before it a number of bills dealing with the broad subject of neutrality. A number of witnesses have appeared before the committee and expressed their views upon these measures. There has been no unanimity of opinion upon the part of those who have testified—indeed, as I understand the testimony, there have been rather violent disagreements. That is to be expected, because when there are international conflicts in various parts of the world, sound legislation dealing in a narrow or comprehensive way with neutrality—with the rights of neutrals and the rights of belligerents—is fraught with great difficulty—indeed, is almost impossible.

In my opinion this is not a propitious moment to enact measures which deal in a narrow or comprehensive way with the problem of neutrality. There are well-recognized principles of international law which obtain during days of peace as well as during periods of war. If international law is to be supplemented by municipal laws and regulations adopted by one or more nations, then such enactments, rules, and regulations should, so far as possible, originate during periods of comparative peace. It is difficult to deal with neutrality when there are serious conflicts, particularly among important and powerful nations. This is especially true in this period of the world's history, when nations are drawn more closely together through trade and commerce and through improved methods of communication and transportation. As we know, many nations depend largely for their prosperity upon international trade. The seas are covered with vessels carrying commodities from all lands, and whenever any conflict arises among nations international trade is seriously affected. Interference with trade and commerce upon land and sea inevitably results when nations are at war. So, as I have indicated, it is a most difficult task—indeed, it taxes the genius and ability of the greatest statesmen for the purpose of formulating neutrality measures. The rights of neutrals and the rights of belligerents are involved in any legislation which falls within the category of neutrality.

It was believed by some that the so-called Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, which was defended with great zeal in this body, would prove beneficial in the solution of neutrality problems. I was one of the few Senators who opposed the bill, and in an address which I delivered in the Senate on Wednesday, April 21, 1937, I pointed out some of the reasons which impelled me to vote against its enactment. I indicated that the measure emphasized belligerent rights, but did not sufficiently indicate neutral rights and responsibilities in determining questions which might arise between neutrals and belligerents. I indicated that the measure seems to be lacking in realism, and that when international difficulties

arose policies framed by nations for the purpose of determining national conduct with respect to those international questions would be disregarded.

It seemed to me then, as it does now, that in the event of international conflicts regulations which one nation may promulgate, hoping to prevent its being drawn into the conflict, would probably be ignored by belligerents if advantages might be derived by such course. If neutral rights are surrendered, it is not to be expected that belligerents will be more constrained to regard conceded neutral rights. Attempts to enumerate rights to be surrendered seems to require an enumeration of rights which are not surrendered. Belligerents are not concerned in the details of local legislation. They are at war and admit no restraints except grudgingly, and even then infringements are made upon international agreements.

It is doubtful that whether by yielding rights isolation could be obtained, or, if so, whether the situation would be satisfactory.

As I have indicated upon several occasions, our country has stood for neutral rights, freedom of the seas, and the right to carry on trade in wartimes as well as in peacetimes. It is true that some of these rights were either surrendered or their loss acquiesced in during the World War.

Perhaps no hard and fast rule can be laid down to govern national action when the circumstances in which that action is taken are unpredictable. If we bar our citizens from travel or its ships from sailing the seas or merchants from trading abroad, there would still be danger of involvement both through the probable action of the contestants or by reason of the probable opposition at home which might force a change of neutrality rules which we had adopted.

As I have indicated, the act of 1937 was so unsatisfactory I felt constrained to oppose it. I believe that in its operations it would help the strong nations, particularly those possessing large shipping interests, and would injure the weak nations, particularly those whose shipping interests were unimportant.

I was so much opposed to the measure that on January 5, 1938, I offered a bill for its repeal. The measure was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but no action was taken by the committee. I still persisted in my opposition to the measure, and on January 4 of this year I offered a similar measure calling for the repeal of the act of May 1, 1937. The latter bill is now before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I hope that it will be given due consideration, and I shall be gratified if it meets the approval of the committee.

I shall not attempt to trespass any further upon the time of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye], but before closing I desire to offer for the Record an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of this date, written by Mr. Walter Lippmann. The article is entitled "The Neutrality Entanglement." Mr. Lippmann, as all Senators know, is a writer of great ability. His views upon political, economic, and social questions are entitled to most serious consideration. I ask that Mr. Lippmann's article be inserted in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 25, 1939]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE NEUTRALITY ENTANGLEMENT

(By Walter Lippmann)

In trying to decide what to do about the Neutrality Act the members of the Senate committee have an extraordinarily difficult problem. Senator BORAH pointed out the difficulty last week when he asked whether it was not impossible for the committee to come "to any agreement which would be accepted as a neutral position." When he asked that question Mr. BORAH came closer to the heart of the real question than has anyone else who has taken part in the debate.

Mr. BORAH gave as his reason for the difficulty that "we," meaning American public opinion, "have practically passed upon who is an aggressor." Undoubtedly that is a great cause why it would now be difficult to have almost anything the Congress enacts "accepted as a neutral position." But the fundamental difficulty would exist if American public opinion were completely detached and morally indifferent on the issues in Europe and Asia. The essential difficulty confronting the committee is that it is com-

pelled to legislate on neutrality at a time when a war is already being fought in Asia and at a time when all of Europe is in a state of warlike mobilization.

This means that Congress is compelled to change the rules of the game while the game is being played. Whatever it does or fails to do, the result will not be universally accepted as neutral. Senator Nye's law has placed Congress in a quandary where Congress is compelled to take a position, and almost any position it takes will immediately and vitally affect the course of events all over the world, will be construed throughout the world by every nation as an act of American national policy.

Take the simplest case. Suppose Congress does nothing. Then on May 1, when section 2 expires, we shall have an embargo on munitions to belligerents, an embargo that is not being applied to Japan and China. Suppose that war breaks out in Europe. We shall then find ourselves supplying Japan, which is a partner of the axis, with munitions while we refuse them to Great Britain, France, and, if they are attacked, to Switzerland and the Netherlands. We shall be supplying munitions to the Asiatic partner of the axis while we are withholding them from the nations that were attacked.

Suppose, then, that Congress reenacts the whole of the existing law. In that event Congress will have reaffirmed so positively its insistence on the present act that the President would be morally bound to impose an embargo against Japan. The effect on Japan would be serious. The sudden change of policy in the midst of her war with China would be unneutral and would give Japan the strongest kind of provocation to make a military alliance with Germany and Italy and to strike, while the British are preoccupied in the Mediterranean, at the Dutch East Indies and the adjacent regions.

If Japan is pushed into the arms of Germany, the axis will not only have gained a powerful ally but, what is worse, the axis will have a strong inducement to go to war now in Europe. For by going to war, the axis can shut off the military supplies that are now moving from this country to England, France, and the Netherlands. The existing law, it must be remembered, permits exports of munitions in time of peace. It stops the exports only in wartime. Therefore, the law, as it is now framed, says that if Germany wants to stop the British and French from obtaining arms in the United States, Germany can do this by declaring war. This is a dangerous inducement to the war party at a time when the peace of the world is trembling in the balance.

Suppose then that Congress goes still further, enacts the Nye-Clark-Bone mandatory embargo. Where does that leave us? It also means an immediate embargo against Japan, followed almost surely by a Japanese military alliance with the axis, creating a situation in which there are the strongest inducements to a triple attack on Great Britain and France. For, having been deprived of American supplies, the Japanese, who are already at war, will have to move. The axis will have acquired a willing, even an urgent, ally, and at the same time it will be able to cut off the supply of munitions to the European democracies.

Suppose then that Congress takes the opposite line and revises the law so that supplies will not be sold to "the aggressor." This would compel Congress to declare a kind of war against Japan, and a kind of war is very likely to become a real war.

We are, no matter what we do, in a position where no one will regard the action of Congress as neutral, where everyone will see that it favors one nation at the expense of another. We need not have been in this entangling position. We have entangled ourselves by Mr. Nye's legislation, and the only real way to disentangle ourselves is to repeal the legislation and take our stand once more on the principles of international law.

This is much the safest course, the most easily defensible, the most consistent with the sentiments and the interest of the American people. If we return to international law, we do not have to intervene in the Far East by changing our policy in the middle of the war. We do not have to challenge Japan at a time when Japan is inevitably in a desperate mood. We shall be able to take the neutral position, which is that Japan and China may buy supplies here in accordance with articles VII and VIII of the Hague Convention of 1907 on the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers. We shall not be entangled in the extremely dangerous consequences that would result from applying an embargo in the middle of a war. We shall remove from Japan the provocation and the inducement to sign a military alliance with the axis and to precipitate a world war.

In regard to Germany and Italy, we shall be taking a position which is legally and morally unassailable. On the other hand, we shall take away from them the hideous inducement to start a war in order to deprive their opponents of supplies that they can obtain only as long as there is no war. The act of repeal, on the other hand, would not only remove the inducement to strike quick, which we now offer to the axis, but it would be profoundly deterrent because it would be construed as making it possible for the coalition to resist successfully.

Above all, repeal would protect the United States against finding itself in a horrible dilemma once war broke out. For then, with public sentiment what it is, with America's national interest what it is, we should at the outbreak of a war, after air raids on London and Paris and the overrunning of Holland and Switzerland, find ourselves compelled to refuse arms to the nations that engaged the overwhelming sympathy of the Nation.

The argument now being conducted before the committees of Congress is emotional enough. Imagine what it would be in the midst of war itself. If in the midst of war we refused to amend the act, a great majority of the people would be horrified at the idea that they were helping aggression to succeed. And if, acting on our sentiments and what many would regard as our vital interests, we then amended the act, we should for all practical purposes have intervened in the war.

The safest course, I repeat, is to repeal the act and return to the elementary principle of international law. This is the only solution that can still be adopted which is legally neutral and can therefore be defended; it is the only solution which can enable us to escape the worst of all the entanglements of a neutral, the entanglements of changing his policy after war breaks out.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I have been more than a little disturbed by reason of the speed with which people have adopted two cries—one cry particularly, to the effect that the Neutrality Act has proven a failure. In my opinion, the Neutrality Act has one lone purpose, and that purpose is to help the United States keep out of other people's wars; and until there can be a demonstration of our involvement in other people's wars in spite of the existence of that act, I do not know by what right, by what rhyming, or by what reasoning anyone can fairly conclude that the Neutrality Act has been a failure.

Unprecedented is the speed with which people have recently adopted as their own the cry that if war comes to Europe our country cannot hope to stay out of that war. Many seem certain that a war in Europe makes our participation inevitable, inescapable. This sort of thinking is alarming, to say the least. It is the kind of thinking that most easily breaks down resistance to being drawn into the wars of other people, wars which would bring unbearable penalties upon our country and its citizens.

"We cannot escape part in it if war comes to Europe." Why does this thought persist and grow, when there is so much reason to believe that we can stay out of war if we but have the will to stay out? Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, and Spain stayed out of the last war. They were 55,000,000 people, living in democracies at the very door of the war in Europe. If they could stay out of the last war, why can we not be sure of a prospect of staying out if war comes to Europe again—we who are 3,000 miles and more removed from the seat of war? Why must we even lend ourselves to the thought that we cannot stay out of another European war? One must naturally be left wondering as to the source of this feeling of inevitability. Are these opinions being planted by chance, by careful purpose? Are they inspired? Are we by any chance being thus early subjected to clever propaganda?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I do not want to digress too far from the Senator's remarks; but I was very much struck a few weeks ago in reading an article, which seemed to be a special article, in one of the newspapers here, in which some local newspaperman had interviewed a man named Warring, who was charged with attempting to bribe a jury, or something like that. The newspaperman went on and interviewed Warring; and during the course of the interview Warring said, "There comes a time in the life of every man when he must go to jail."

I was rather struck by the similarity between that remark and the attitude of many persons in this country. I have never figured out that I was going to jail, and I do not think more than 2 or 3 percent of the population figure that they are really going to jail; but I was struck with the similarity between that attitude and the attitude of many persons in the country that at regular intervals there come times when the country must go to war.

Mr. NYE. One is about as inevitable as the other, I should say; and I thank the Senator from Washington for

his very striking example of how easily some persons can make themselves believe that this, that, and another course are inevitable.

I have asked if by any chance there might be a purpose of propaganda behind this feeling that persists and grows. It can fairly be said that the greatest danger to our peace in America is propaganda, from abroad and propaganda from home; influences that adopt No. 1 causes ahead of the cause of Americanism, and ahead of the cause of the security of our great country. If we can learn to expect this propaganda, and be prepared better to distinguish it when it is in evidence, we shall surely find ourselves much better prepared to avoid being devoured in other peoples' wars another time.

Today I make it my business to point to what may be expected in the way of foreign propaganda intended to invite our active interest in more of Europe's hates and wars. Propaganda there will be; that we may be sure; indeed, propaganda there is today. A few days ago the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] very forcefully remarked that whether or not the former Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, wanted to recognize it, nevertheless it is true that foreign propaganda is at work in the United States today. It does not matter in the least from which side it may come, the fact still remains that propaganda is not a good tonic for us. We are having it dished up to us by both sides involved in Europe today. There will be more of it; and I should like to plead with the Senate to be prepared for it and to be ready to define it.

An English writer has declared that while British propaganda was very successful during the World War, its success was in the end more largely traceable to the miserable failure of German propaganda. In the light of what I am about to suggest by way of information which I think the Senate should have, I am inclined to believe that, with all the blunders of Germany and her propaganda machine in 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917, they never did anything quite so brazen as is being done today by men in authority in Britain who are laying the foundation for the involvement of the United States in her next war, for whatever cause it may be.

At this point I desire to say that I have great sympathy with the expression which came yesterday from the lips of Gen. Hugh S. Johnson when he declared that he had no desire for the erection of a monument in his memory in Rome or in Berlin. Likewise he vowed that he was not interested in having a monument erected to him in London or in Paris. His words were well chosen; for there has been intent on the part of Americans—some of them great and leading Americans—to plant in the American mind the conclusion that anyone who fought against involvement in the European squabble was seeking or inviting the favor of one side or another engaged in the present European battle of words and propaganda.

I am not speaking today and I am not offering in evidence what I do offer in evidence because I think it will help or hurt any particular European cause. I offer it alone for the purpose it may serve in maintaining the one great democracy that exists and continues upon the earth. I want to call attention to the plans of one foreign country—plans cunningly laid—for our involvement in her next war.

If I were to charge openly the things that are going soon to appear in evidence, if I were to stand here and allege that this country and its propagandists intend to do this, that, and the other thing to America, Senators would be on their toes demanding to know what kind of authority could exist for such a contention. I say, Mr. President, these plans that are British to take the United States into Britain's next war, whatever the cause of that war may be, are unbelievable. If I were to stand here and say that Great Britain hopes that in her next war Japan will be opposed to her, Senators would rise and demand to know the authority for any such statement; but the truth of the matter is that Great Britain's minds today are anticipating that the one easy, sure way to involve the United States on the side of Britain in another

war is to have Japan arrayed against Great Britain in that conflict. The easy way to get us into the next conflict that they think is coming is to have our alleged prejudices against the Japanese appealed to.

The authority I am about to quote today may be questioned. There has been published a series of works under the title "The Next War." One of the volumes in this series is entitled "Propaganda in the Next War." This particular volume was written by one Sidney Rogerson. I have been unable to obtain any trace of his background or of his connections; but the editor in chief of all these works, including the one entitled "Propaganda in the Next War," is a man whose name is recognized the world over as an authority in Great Britain. He is none other than Capt. Liddell Hart, associated with the London Times, a writer and a military authority in Europe. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point the account which I find in the British "Who's Who" concerning Capt. Liddell Hart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Liddell Hart, Basil Henry: Military correspondent of the Times, and its adviser on defence in general; b. 31 Oct. 1895; m. 1918, Jessie, d. of J. J. Stone, Stratford Lodge, Stroud; one s. Educ.; St. Paul's; Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. K. O. Y. L. I.; served European War, 1914-18 (wounded); half-pay, 1924; retired, 1927; Military correspondent of the Daily Telegraph, 1925-35; military editor of the Encyclopaedia Britannica; evolved the battle drill system (1917) and various tactical methods officially adopted since the war; the modernised infantry drill; the theory of the indirect approach in strategy; one of the three referees for Army Gold Medal Essay, 1924; Lees-Knowles lecturer, Trinity College, Cambridge, 1932-33; Leverhulme Research Fellow, 1934; officially visited the training centres of the French Army, 1926; the Italian Army and Air Force similarly, 1927; critiques circulated by General Staff; British Delegation International Studies Conference, 1935; Co-opted Member of the County of London Territorial Association; of the Executive Committee of the League of Nations Union; on the Council of the Society for Army Historical Research; Member of the Institute of Historical Research; F. R. Hist., S. Publications; New Methods of Infantry training, 1918; Science of Infantry Tactics, 1921; 3rd edition, 1926; Paris, or the Future of War, 1925; A Greater than Napoleon—Scipio Africanus, 1926; The Remaking of Modern Armies, 1927; Great Captains Unveiled (Jenghiz Khan, Sabutai, Gustavus, Wallenstein, Saxe, Wolfe), 1927; Reputations—Ten Years After (historical studies of Joffe, Foch, Haig, Petain, Ludendorff-Falkenhayn, Gallieni, Pershing, Allenby, Liggett), 1928; The Decisive Wars of History, 1929; Sherman, 1930; The Real War, 1914-18, 1930; Foch—The Man of Orleans, 1931; The British Way in Warfare, 1932; The Future of Infantry, 1933; The Ghost of Napoleon, 1933; T. E. Lawrence—in Arabia and After, 1934, new edition, 1935; A History of the World War (enlarged from The Real War), 1934; When Britain Goes to War (enlarged from The British Way in Warfare), 1935; The War in Outline, 1936; Europe in Arms, 1937; Through the Fog of War, 1938; translations of writings in French, German, Italian, Russian, Arabic, and ten other languages; Joint Author of the official manual Infantry Training, 1921; Editor, Small Arms Training, 1924; criticised by request, post-war French Infantry regulations for their official organ, 1922-23. Address: 123 Gloucester Place, W. 1. T.: Welbeck, 3425. Clubs: Athenaeum, Army and Navy, Savage.

Mr. NYE. This work, Propaganda in the Next War, staggers the imagination. It amazes me that men could be so brazen in laying down the plans which are to entrap us, publish them, and give them, at least for a few days, to the world.

I understand that this particular volume, Propaganda in the Next War, published last fall and placed in circulation, instead of having its circulation enlarged, now is suffering at the hands of those who desire to retire it from circulation. A few days ago I came on the floor of the Senate with the volume itself. I am sorry I have not it with me today. I am told that it is the only copy of Propaganda in the Next War available in the United States. It can be had; I can borrow it again if there is occasion and need for it in the Senate; but it is no longer easy to obtain. I wish the entire work might be read by every Member of the Senate. One particular chapter, however, is one which every Member of the Senate ought to be required to read. It is the chapter entitled "Enemies, Neutrals, and Allies," a large portion of which is given over to a description of just how they are going to manage their propaganda upon the United States in the

event of the next war; and in the light of what we are seeing happen day after day in this country, I am given to wonder, as others must be given to wonder, if perchance that propaganda is not already under way.

"Enemies, Neutrals, and Allies" is the title of chapter 4, which I have had typed from the book *Propaganda in the Next War*. I shall not read all of it to the Senate, but after I shall have concluded reading certain portions of it I shall ask unanimous consent that the whole chapter be printed in the *RECORD* as a part of my remarks.

Mr. President, the early pages of the chapter are given over to the manner in which England will handle propaganda in the countries of her enemies, how she will get her propaganda to the people in the lands which she is fighting in the next war. We find this writer and authority pointing out, too, how large a part in world consideration the word "democracy" is going to play in the next war, how readily it lends itself to a play which will invite the prejudices of a people who may not stop to analyze what is being done under the name and in the name of "democracy."

This British authority and writer is greatly concerned for fear they are not going to be able to make as large use another time as they did during the last war of so-called atrocity stories, remembering how easily they preyed upon our minds and worked upon our sympathies by the tales, since proven so thoroughly untrue, of the dismemberment of women and children, and the other terrible inflictions that were visited upon helpless people. Now they wonder if it is going to take at another time, in light of the fact, strange as it may seem, that there are so many atrocities being practiced all over the world today without any war being involved. The writer says:

Atrocity propaganda will be less effective with neutrals in the next war. They have been sated with it in peace.

Since on paper our case toward neutrals appears to lack a main-spring, it will behoove us to manufacture what we can and press it everywhere we can—a task of making bricks with little straw, at which we showed ourselves to excel in the last war.

I wish to stress particularly the plans of propagandists to take their straws, in the form of statements which lack truth, and manufacture them into the brick which are to be our undoing, destroy our neutrality, and embroil us in another foreign war. The writer continues:

In the realm of the moving-picture industry we may be able to depend on the natural bias of the United States film manufacturers in favor of Great Britain as opposed to Germany, Japan, or Italy, and on their command of the machinery of international film distribution. This will be an asset both with the stock entertainment picture and the news reels.

Again we find the author of this work on British propaganda in the next war demonstrating how they will resort to the use of foreign languages in portraying their cause. But part 4 of this particular chapter is the one directly devoted to us here in the United States, and I shall insist on reading almost in its entirety that portion of the work. I read:

There remains the United States—the great neutral. In the next war, as in the last, the result will probably depend upon the way in which the United States acts, and her attitude will reflect the reaction of her public to propaganda properly applied. During the Great War the efforts of the rival propagandists in the United States almost stagger belief. The Germans were the more amazing and their activities amounted to a degree of interference in American domestic affairs which will surely never be tolerated again. They entered the field of United States labor politics, organizing their own union. They set up all sorts of propagandist bodies, whether supposedly pacifist organizations which adroitly blamed the Allies for keeping the war going or bureaus to work upon and inflame Negro opinion. They appealed to university-trained and professional men. They reached women by forming such bodies as the League of American Women for Strict Neutrality, and workingmen through Labor's National Peace Council. They even bought a New York daily paper. We were almost as thorough though less blatant in our methods. Among our multifarious activities was the supply of a regular British news sheet to no fewer than 360 smaller American papers.

For some time the issue as to which side the United States would take hung in the balance, and in the final result was a credit to our propaganda—

Meaning British propaganda—

We were helped by the carelessness of the Germans. They continually overreached themselves and, with all their native tendency to overorganization, forgot to cover up their tracks. Their propaganda was as obvious as it was energetic. I repeat, it is unthinkable that such a dog fight between non-Americans will again be permitted in the United States.

That is a happy conclusion to draw. I wish we might draw the same conclusion, that we could hope to escape that dog fight in propaganda. But I wonder how well prepared we are to avoid repetition of the same degree of propagandist dog fight as that which occurred at that time.

This British writer says, in another portion of his work:

Secondly, the American peoples are still under the influence of much of the Great War propaganda. They are more susceptible than most peoples to mass suggestion—they have been brought up on it—and since 1918 they have shut themselves off from reality. Thirdly, they are at this moment the battleground of an active propaganda of labels.

There is no sense in refusing to recognize that there has always been a substratum of suspicion of Great Britain in the United States.

Then the author proceeds to show how in the years that followed the last war much of that which was basic to the building of our prejudices in the United States against Great Britain has been eliminated. Correctives have been accomplished. The issues are no longer what they then were; but this writer admits there are still some prejudices. He says in this regard:

There remain the Jews. It has been estimated that of the world Jew population of approximately 15,000,000, no fewer than 5,000,000 are in the United States. Twenty-five percent of the inhabitants of New York are Jews. During the Great War—

I want the Senators to note this language of this British author—

During the Great War we bought off—

Do not misunderstand me—

we bought off this huge American Jewish public by the promise of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, held by Ludendorff to be the master stroke of allied propaganda, as it enabled us not only to appeal to Jews in America but to Jews in Germany as well. Since then our attempts to implement our undertaking have landed us in difficulties with the indigenous Arabs, agitated by Italian propaganda, without satisfying the Jews. We have not satisfied the educated British Jews. How much less have we satisfied the more remote Jew community on the other side of the Atlantic?

In addition, the recent realist policy of the British Government has been worked up into a propaganda of significant extent and intensity which represents Great Britain as being "half Fascist," excuse the label, all ready and prepared to "sell the democratic pass" and go "all Fascist" at the first convenient opportunity. This is being developed by the intense Jewish hatred of Germany and from her of all dictator countries, and backed by the influence of the Catholic Church and undenominational liberals. At the moment, we have a strong section of American opinion against us, but if war were to break out tomorrow between England and Germany this mass of opinion would have to come down on one side or the other, and it will be marvelous indeed if German propaganda could succeed in bringing it down on theirs.

In general, the situation in the United States is more favorable to Great Britain than in 1914, in that the obvious centers of infection have been removed, but less favorable in that we have temporarily at any rate lost caste as a "democratic" state because of the propaganda which represents us as truckling to, or at least having truck with "dictators." Though we are not unfavorably placed, we shall require to do much propaganda to keep the United States benevolently neutral. To persuade her to take our part will be much more difficult, so difficult as to be unlikely to succeed. It will need a definite threat to America, a threat, moreover, which will have to be brought home by propaganda to every citizen, before the Republic will again take arms in an external quarrel.

But this author is certain that there is one challenge which will surely bring the United States into Britain's next war. Listen to the author:

The position will naturally be considerably eased if Japan were involved, and this might and probably would bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the Great War they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany.

Fortunately with America, our propaganda is on firm ground. We can be entirely sincere, as our main plank will be the old democratic one. We must clearly enunciate our belief in the democratic form of government and our firm resolve to adhere to it.

Our minor propaganda will aim at attaching the support of important sections, such as the Jews, probably by the declaration of a clear-cut policy in Palestine, and of our intention, if victorious, to put an end to anti-Semitic persecutions; and of the Roman Catholic community in similar terms. These should not be difficult to pursue nor to put over to the American public. We shall, as before, send over our leading literary lights and other men with names well known in the United States to put our point of view over the dinner table. Our trouble here will be to find men with equally commanding reputations to step into the shoes of such as Kipling, Barrie, Shaw, Galsworthy, and Wells. Conversely, we should exploit to the full the views and experiences of American nations who might be serving in our forces or those of our allies.

And so on, and on, and on, Mr. President, goes this author, picturing the plans, the means that will be resorted to to invite active American interest in the British cause, whatever that cause may be. So go their plans to make sure that America will repeat her serious mistake of 1917, and enter a foreign war, pouring out her resources of life and wealth for the winning of what we thought to be the finest causes upon this earth, only to discover after the war was all over that we did not have a chance to win one of those causes when we went into that war. There is no assurance that we would be able to win anything more than the war. And I hope with all my heart, Mr. President, that we in the United States will take that last experience and lay it alongside of the promise that is made by these British authorities to bring into play their propaganda upon us, and that thereby we may be led to a conviction that before ever we move in that direction again we must have more assurance by far than we had the last time that we may be able to win the things we say we are fighting for, as well as win the war.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I apologize to the Senator for interrupting him, but I did not hear his opening remarks, so I have been unable to learn who is going to get us into war. Who is it that wants to drag us in? And from what is the Senator reading?

Mr. NYE. I take it the Senator from Indiana was not here when I began my argument.

Mr. MINTON. No; I was not in the Senate Chamber when the Senator from North Dakota began. I am sorry.

Mr. NYE. I have been reading from a chapter appearing in a book published in Great Britain last fall entitled "Propaganda in the Next War." The author is Sidney Rogerson. The editor in chief of this book, and the series of books running along with it under the heading *The Next War*, is Capt. Liddell Hart, an eminent British authority on the staff of the New York Times, who gives his assistance to this work, and gives it a credit which cannot be denied.

Mr. MINTON. What contacts have these men in the United States which lead the Senator to believe that such dire things are going to happen?

Mr. NYE. I am sorry the Senator did not hear me read precisely the people in this country to whom the British propagandists will be looking to help them pull their chestnuts out of the fire in the next emergency.

Mr. MINTON. The information is in the *RECORD*, then?

Mr. NYE. Yes. I know the Senator will, with much interest, read it in the *RECORD*.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I listened with a great deal of interest to his remarks on the same subject, upon which I spoke yesterday in the Senate. I am interested in obtaining a little information. As I understand, this distinguished author says that if and when Europe gets into war America will be the target again for propaganda from both sides. Is that correct?

Mr. NYE. Well, he is a little more direct than that. He suggests how they will manage the next time to get us into their war.

Mr. WILEY. In the statement the Senator has presented it was set forth how the Allies and also the Central Powers

during the last war did everything to bring us into the conflict on one side or the other. It was further suggested in the statement that perhaps in the next war America will not permit this land to be such a fertile ground for propaganda, and that brings me to this thought: Have aliens in the United States any right to freedom of speech or freedom of the press when it involves a matter of propaganda or involves the question of getting us into war?

Mr. NYE. If they do have such right, and there be their kind who want to involve us in war, we certainly ought to see to it that any right of that kind is taken away from them, and I wish the way might be found to do it.

Mr. WILEY. That is what I was going to suggest. Has the Senator any concrete suggestion now, anticipating that Europe may get into war, as to what we should do to stop the alleged propagandists in the future?

Mr. NYE. Under the Constitution, there is a large question in my mind how far we can go in legislating in that field. I do not think it ought to be difficult at all to legislate the alien out of an influential position.

Mr. WILEY. That is my theory.

Mr. NYE. But I am sure that the minute we did that the alien would invite the cooperation and make available to himself the interests and the activities of those who have American citizenship. Those things can be bought for a price from people who do not look very far ahead to what the consequences might be.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. We will not have to worry much about the propaganda contained in the book to which the Senator referred, as I understand there is only one copy of it in the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. NYE. The Senator has not yet understood just what this book is.

Mr. MINTON. Is there more than one copy in the United States?

Mr. NYE. I am told that it is probably the only copy in the United States.

Mr. MINTON. Who owns the copy, if that is not asking the Senator an unfair question?

Mr. NYE. Will the Senator be satisfied if I tell him that a dean in a very prominent American university is in possession of the book? I have seen it.

Mr. MINTON. If it is so closely guarded and so little circulated, we do not have to worry much about the propaganda it contains, do we?

Mr. NYE. From the standpoint of the British propagandists, I think what they would least desire is the circulation of this particular book among us. The book is plainly a handbook for British propagandists. I am told that this work and other works are accepted as handbooks in British military circles. Liddell Hart is quite an authority on this and other subjects, and is looked upon as such.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I happen to have seen that volume, and I think it was not intended for circulation in this country, but rather to be a handbook for British propaganda.

Mr. NYE. That is quite correct.

Mr. BONE. It was not intended to be propaganda in this country, but merely to explain the technique and the method of approach that would be employed by British propagandists in the event of war.

Mr. NYE. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. It was not intended to reach the American public, but to provide for the British propagandists some sort of mechanism of approach in spreading propaganda. Am I correct?

Mr. NYE. The Senator is entirely correct. I may say that my whole purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, and, if it reaches that far, to the attention of the country, is to show the existence of a basic plan of propaganda to involve us in the next war, to the end that in the future we may be far better prepared than we have been

in the past to know it when we see it, when we encounter it, and be better prepared to resist it.

Mr. MINTON. Has the Senator any information about anyone who is trying to carry out the plan outlined in the handbook to which he has referred? I think it would be very interesting to know who it is that is trying to carry it out.

Mr. NYE. I think we would probably find something very interesting if we could have access to the lists of foreign educators and lecturers who have been spreading themselves out over America during the last couple of months. I hope to be prepared with such a list at an early date.

Mr. MINTON. Has the Senator observed any foreign lecturers anywhere in our country using the technique outlined in the handbook to which he has referred?

Mr. NYE. No; I have not. I ask that the entire chapter from which I have been reading be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Next War, a series edited by Capt. Liddell Hart]

PROPAGANDA IN THE NEXT WAR

(By Sidney Rogerson)

CHAPTER IV. ENEMIES, NEUTRALS, AND ALLIES

It should now be possible, it is hoped, to see fairly clearly what amount of offensive propaganda will be practicable in the next war and the methods by which it is to be pressed. At the same time it will, for obvious reasons, not be desirable to inquire too closely into the subject, especially so far as it concerns action toward the enemy.

It has been seen that Germany, to a lesser degree Italy, and in a different manner Japan, will constitute difficult problems for the offensively minded propagandist. Directing our thoughts on Germany, we should remark that whereas in 1914 the "all-highest" was enthusiastically supported by the majority of Germans, the regime rested on the basis of a governing caste. On a conservative estimate there must have been from 30 to 45 percent of German opinion opposed politically to the imperial system and lukewarm or antipathetic to its interests. These radical and socialist elements were powerful, well organized, and owned their own press. After the first flush of racial patriotism cooled, but before war weariness had set in, they represented a potentially receptive atmosphere for liberal propaganda. When the blockade and military pressure became acute, they were readily influenced by our propaganda to become agents of disaffection or peace. We had, therefore, an audience to appeal to in the enemy's country. We had also the message to which this audience were by nature or conviction sympathetic—the message of liberty, freedom, and equality. There were still parliamentary forms of government in Germany and Austria, based vaguely on our own Westminster model. The radical elements in the two countries had faith in these and believed that the machine could be captured by electoral methods and used to carry out the reforms in which they were interested. The gospel of our propagandists was their gospel. Thirdly, we had the means to reach them through their papers and our pamphlets. The former were naturally subject to wartime censorship, but they were not then bolted and barred against every item of copy that had not been scrutinized and approved by Government propaganda experts trained to detect the faintest suspicion of antinational propaganda. Substantial was the volume of such propaganda which these papers reproduced, lifted largely from their contemporaries in Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, and Scandinavia. Regular news services were supplied by our propagandists to these countries in the certainty that much of them would be copied into the German press. Then the trench lines ran close together from the sand dunes of Dunkerque to the Alps. Pamphlets were shot over by mortars and grenades to the fighting troops and dropped in millions over the back areas and in Germany. In all this propaganda we had, moreover, very much our own way. We could concentrate on the work in hand in the absence of any concerted German counter propaganda.

Next time the conditions will be very different. The basis on which the German regime rests has been made much broader. It is now a popular, as opposed to a caste regime, and it will have, in the early days at any rate, the support of the bulk of the German masses, as well as a large percentage of the classes. There will be the antipathetic minority, but this will be much more closely watched and controlled, and moreover will not be inherently susceptible to the old democratic slogans. It will tend naturally to connect these with the dark days of inflation, Spartacist and Communist risings, the occupations by French and African troops, the days of hatreds, humiliations, and starvation, and the connection of ideas will have been cleverly fostered by energetic and all-pervading propaganda. Not only will the old slogans be unacceptable, but it will be much more difficult to present them. There will be no papers to rely upon other than those pursuing an effective anti-democratic policy by advancing the concrete gospel of national

socialism. There will, in addition, be less opportunity for the organization of pamphlet campaigns—that is, unless a German-French fighting front is again stabilized along the Maginot line, for example. Finally, the enemy will not be supine as in the Great War, but engaged actively and efficiently in developing a propaganda offensive against us.

Where, then, are we to look for the weak chinks in his totalitarian armor? Where, for the matter of that, are we to find a propaganda blade "fit for the deed we have to do"? The problem, as I see it, lies not so much in the strength of the enemy's position as in our difficulty of selecting a constructive line of policy which we can adhere to and which will make any effective appeal to people brought up on totalitarian propaganda. There are some lines which we can rule out from the beginning. We cannot propose a vote of no confidence in the regime nor hope to benefit from abuse of Hitler. We cannot advance a propaganda of material well-being. The Germans have been taught that we live in luxury and slothfulness, but that we are soullessly selfish, and that we will see to it that no one else gets a share of our comforts if we can prevent it. We cannot promise the benefits of democratic freedom. The German has too much experience of this or what he thinks it implies, and has risen to that fly once already. We cannot promise territorial rewards. After all, it will be argued, England has had chances innumerable of making some arrangement about colonies, which she would not take. "Now," the enemy propagandist may declare, "Germany is going to force her to disgorge or perish in the attempt."

As with Germany so with Italy and Japan. None of the old-time rallying cries of "liberty" or "democracy" or some association of free peoples are calculated to have any influence. While the totalitarian states are fresh and confident I cannot see any constructive line of propaganda policy that is open to us to pursue against them, and there is no justification for the assumption that they will tire any more quickly than states less organized for war. This need not dismay us, however. Offensive propaganda does not begin to be effective until the atmosphere is receptive; in the Great War nearly 4 years had passed before this condition was reached. It is on this account that I began by saying that it is reasonable to argue that the next war will not favor the development of propaganda directly against the enemy; but, as I have stressed throughout, if it should develop into a war of attrition, propaganda will come into its own again. Some constructive idea would then almost certainly be thrown up; and we shall have men clever enough, I hope, to seize on this and exploit it. Unless war spreads and involves all Europe, and we again attempt to engage in it on the Continent, there will be no points at which Great Britain and Germany will touch. Our frontiers may be the Rhine and theirs the Thames Estuary, but these will only be maintained in the air, if at all. Therefore air-borne propaganda, whether by airplane or radio, looks to be the only obvious means of approaching each other at first.

If there is one direction in which we may look with a reasonable hope of results for the creation of a favorable atmosphere, it is to the rigidity of the German propaganda control. We may well take a hint from jujitsu, and see how far we may use the enemy's strength against him. I cannot believe that a healthy and virile people, however conscientious they are in acquiescing in control in the national interest, can feel happy when this control is arbitrarily extended to cover the most trivial items of general interest. There is evidence that good Germans, educated men and many of them loyal members of "the party," already rely upon English and foreign newspapers to keep abreast of general nonpolitical developments. The German has a veneration for knowledge. He elevates erudition on a high altar, and is concerned at all times to appear well informed. It is not merely that he is genuinely fond of learning; he senses also that he is the parvenu in European civilization. How often have I not had Germans apologize to me that in political development their country was 200 years behind our own, arguing that this was why we found it so difficult to understand their methods. It is a manifestation of an inferiority complex that impels the barbarian, conscious of his skins and his cave drawings, to cry down the silks and oil paintings of civilization as evidence of decadence, the while he furtively but energetically sets about copying them to the best of his ability. This is no very inaccurate description of the German attitude, with the addition that the German leaders from Nietzsche to Ludendorff and Stuermer have tried to make a virtue out of this barbarian inferiority and to raise the idol of the "blond beast" and of "blood and iron." I suggest, therefore, that this sense of inferiority may be played upon and that our propaganda should stress to the Germans their ignorance. There must be no blame laid on their leaders. On the contrary, these must be extolled for their ability in difficult circumstances, the implication being that they, too, are ignorant of what the world is thinking. Excellent fellows, no doubt, but blind leaders of the blind. Once an uneasiness about comparatively small facts that have been kept from them is planted in the minds of thinking Germans, something important will have been accomplished. In the circumstances, even this much will be difficult, but not impossible. Although German preparedness is avowedly based on the need to defend the Fatherland, the theory that is implied in all the re-arming and mass mobilization is surely one of attack. Germany is taking over the French doctrine of *elan*, "l'audace, toujours l'audace," and basing her hopes and her organization on a swift overwhelming onrush. She has, I think, in her home propaganda,

not directly but by implication, lifted the eyes of her people away from the old, humiliating pictures of defense against encircling enemies to the newer visions of all Germans united to assert themselves against those who deny them their rights. It should therefore be psychologically correct to see how this new-found, though as yet untried, confidence can be struck the most telling blow. This seems to me to lie in the organization, immediately on the outbreak of war, of large-scale air attacks on the German industrial centers in which not only bombs but pamphlets would be dropped pointing out that poor Fritz was probably so ill informed that he did not know that British planes could reach German cities as easily as the converse—and that they would do so. The keynote all through would be obliquely the suppression of information in Germany, coupled with direct revelations, which the propagandee might verify, based on the course of operations. By this method propaganda would be combined with offensive military action, which I believe would be psychologically right.

The same text would be discoursed upon in all our radio broadcasts directed to neutral countries in the hope that they would be picked up in Germany. We should inform the Dutch, the Swiss, and others how amazing it was that even the more ordinary occurrences were withheld from the Germans. From time to time there would be opportunist sniping of detailed news, such as casualties, over German wave lengths and disguised interpolations when a German station was silent during an interval. The latter might be made very effective on the same theme. An even more directly hopeful field to exploit would be the enemy nationals domiciled in foreign countries. There are large concentrations of Germans, Italians, and Japanese in South America, notably in Brazil, in the United States of America, and elsewhere, and it will be the duty of our propagandists to see that a steady stream of information is directed at these and that facilities are tacitly accorded to them to relay the gist of this in their letters home to their countryfolk behind the bars of totalitarian suppression. Sympathetically worked upon, these extramural enemy nationals will be the most convincing witnesses to the truth, so many stones dropped into the propaganda pond whose ripples may be readily enlarged upon. Simultaneously every effort would be made to reach disaffected intellectuals and others by having news or pamphlets posted to them inside Germany, though this would be much more difficult than previously, especially in the early stages of a war.

Japan seems to be quite as difficult to attack directly by propaganda, but her Achilles' heel, as I have suggested, may well be found in the countries she has annexed. It should be a first duty to attempt by propaganda to foment sedition in Formosa, Korea, Manchuria, and such parts of China proper as she may by then have taken under her control, so that as large a part of her energies as possible are dissipated in dealing with insurrection and revolt. While it seems tolerably certain that there will be plenty of lines of appeal, including some concrete idea of delivery from oppression, calculated to appeal to people subjected to a tyranny as harsh as the Japanese, the problem will be how to reach them. Newspapers will be a slender hope; they will only circulate among the educated handful, and their activities and contents will be subject to the most rigorous censorship. The wireless will be relatively useless in regions too far distant from potential transmitting stations and where a receiving set is a conspicuous rarity. The same applies to the cinema. There will be picture theaters in the great cities, but these will be under strict military control. There remain the airplane-and-pamphlet and the word-of-mouth methods of propaganda, and both these will be used to the limit. It is difficult to imagine Japan being engaged in a major war which did not also involve Russia, a fact which would immensely facilitate the development of anti-Japanese propaganda throughout the countries of the Far Eastern mainland, though there would be reactions against Russian-made propaganda among sections where anti-Communist views were in the ascendant.

Italy, as I have said, is a more hopeful problem. Both owing to the liberal heaven and to the existence of a traditional feeling of friendship for Great Britain, there is a chance of making propaganda directly at the Italian peoples. The former will, unless the existing restrictions are greatly tightened up on the advent of war, afford ways and means for the entry of propaganda into Italy; the latter might constitute a valuable basis for our propaganda, especially, if and when the time should come, against the Duce. It should only be necessary for his speeded-up timetable of war plans to miscarry, for the Italians to learn of reverses as aerial and naval war was carried to their coasts; for us to point out that in the good old days, before they were led into the paths of oppression and conquest by their brilliant leader, such bloodshed of Italians by British airmen or sailors would have been unthinkable. Think of all the thousands of Italians interned in England. But how happy they are! How well fed and cared for! Here are some photos of men from Naples, imprisoned in the Alexandra Palace. They send their salutations to their brothers, undernourished and anxious. This line of propaganda attack will, I fancy, be likely to be possible earlier and to work more quickly against Italy than either Germany or Japan. The Germans have always vaguely felt that they had a divine mission; they have a great faith in their race and in themselves. The Japanese are confident to the pitch of bigotry. The Italians are less sure of themselves. I repeat, it is only possible to do so much by precept and teaching, and all this Mussolini has done. He cannot change his raw material, only improve it; nor make a colonial administration out of men who are more content

to be led. Thus, the morale of the Italian will not be entirely above suspicion and, moreover, his newly acquired colonial Empire will be a positive source of danger. The Italian Peninsula may poke a dangerous finger into our imperial communications, and Italian propaganda and intrigue stir up hornets' nests about our ears in the Near East and Egypt, but Italy is very vulnerable herself. The Germans of the Trentino must dislike their Italian masters as much as they must be casting longing eyes across the Brenner. Then there are the Arabs of Libya, over whom the Italian lords it repressively but uneasily, and the freshly won Empire of Abyssinia. Here are surely foci for propaganda so long as we can select a line of policy which we can advance toward Arabs or Abyssinians without reacting on African peoples under our own flag.

There are, then, two indicated lines of propaganda action—one designed to shake the Italian's confidence in himself and his leaders; the other to stir up trouble in the lands where Italians rule over other peoples. The Italians are held in low regard not only by the white but by some of the colored races. This should simplify the direction of propaganda toward their African colonies, and the fact that these march with British possessions or spheres of influence should enable comparisons between the African's lot in Abyssinia under Italian rule to be contrasted with that in Kenya or Tanganyika under the British flag.

There will also be immediately available a wider variety of means for disseminating propaganda against Italy than against Germany or Japan. Italian newspapers might even in certain circumstances be capable of exploitation fairly soon. Extensive use would undoubtedly be made of the pamphlet-carrying airplane both in Italy and her colonies and the radio would help with the Italians as well as in certain of her possessions where there are receiving sets.

II

Taking it all in all, however, there does not seem to be a great future for the direct propaganda offensive in the next war, unless this should turn out to be a protracted and wearying affair. For offensive propaganda we shall look rather to the indirect variety, directed toward neutrals and allies—to engage the former on our side if possible, but at all costs to prevent their going over to the enemy, and to keep the latter at concert pitch against the enemy. This neutral zone will be the great battleground of propaganda, where both sets of combatants will fight each other with all their energies and every known method. Here again, unless I am mistaken, we may find ourselves up against a tough problem at first. Here it is:

During the Great War the world lay under the spell of democracy. It was still a word to conjure with; no one had dared to challenge its meaning. Despite the presence of Japan and Russia in the ranks of the Allies, and of the near republic of the young Turks among the central empires, the war was fairly accurately represented by allied propagandists as a struggle between "democracy" and the "forces of reaction," the implication being that "democracy" was to stop the world from plunging into "chaos and night." Since 1918 democracy has been challenged. It is now on the defensive. Germany and Italy are constructive as well as repressive. They have an idea to put forward—not, many people may say, a first-class idea, but a concrete one all the same. Their battalions of trained propagandists make the very best out of it, representing their countries as the forces of the new progress. Democracy, they assert, led to all sorts of humiliation and trouble—some countries into an uneasy twilight and others into definite "chaos and night." From this sorry state the "forces of progress" have rescued or are rescuing them. Whereas in 1914-18 democracy could be represented as the new force which held out a hope to a hopeless world, now it is being represented as the force which has been used by unscrupulous countries to cover their seizure of all that is worth having and, having taken this, to preserve the status quo in a world of inequalities of work and wealth. The result of this propaganda is that while the democratic states—whether under a crowned sovereign or top-hatted president—have dwindled, the authoritarian model is very popular. Roughly speaking, the democracies are Great Britain, Belgium, France, the United States of America, Switzerland, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries. The dictatorships are Germany, Italy, Russia, Turkey, Portugal, Japan, Greece, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and practically all the South American Republics, led by Brazil. Spain will shortly join their ranks, and possibly China, if she can hold out long enough against the Japanese. Not all of these are totalitarian in the strict sense of the word, nor necessarily of a National Socialist character, but all are undemocratic in fact, and many of them therefore antidemocratic in spirit.

Some of them were once seats of British influence, notably South America, but are now under a constant spray of German and Italian propaganda by wireless news, short-wave radio talks, and personal effort which has begun to percolate. Some of them, like Portugal, are traditional friends and will probably be on our side in sentiment if not in fact in the next war, but what propaganda line, unless the enemy presents us with a special opportunity, can we take with Portugal except our centuries-old friendship? Turkey is a vigorous state which will be most important to us, and which we are assiduously wooing with apparent success, but in the actual field of propaganda what can be put forward against Germany that is constructive? There can be no doubt that the next war will be billed as a fight between democracy and dictatorship. It may in fact be nothing of the sort. We might get Italy as a partner and Germany Belgium; authoritarian Portugal is likely to come in with us and the democratic Scandinavian countries may

well remain strictly neutral. In the ultimate resort, alliances spring from the hope of material advantage, not the possession of a common ideological belief, but in our propaganda we must make the facts fit our case as far as possible. We shall almost certainly represent the struggle in the propaganda we shall be compelled to do toward France, the United States of America, and our own Empire as democracy and freedom versus dictatorship and persecution. As propaganda must be unified, how are we to pursue the energetic policy we should to the neutrals, many of whom, like Spain, Portugal, Greece, and Turkey are so vital to us? We cannot speak with two voices in our propaganda. This, of course, applies to what, borrowing a military adjective, I may call the grand propaganda. Without this backbone minor propaganda can only achieve little with much effort, though we shall obviously set out to do as much of this as we can. It will enable us to burke the main issue, and it can, of course, be very embarrassing to the enemy. A storm of quite respectable dimensions was, for example, in 1916 worked up in neutral countries with a snapshot of Bernstorff, the then German Ambassador to America. The photo which was picked up from Bernstorff's desk by an alert British agent showed the ambassador in a "swimsuit" with his arm around two "bathing belles" similarly clad. It was entirely innocent, but it was published almost all over the world in such a fashion as to suggest the worst sort of ambassadorial gallantry, conduct unbecoming even a Prussian officer and a gentleman! Again my feeling is that it will be more difficult to prejudice neutral feeling against Germany or Italy than against Japan. How, for example, can we hope to rouse passions against the German dictatorship by reciting the persecutions of Jews who are thrust into concentration camps, thrashed, and spit upon, or against the Italian by broadcasting the number of Arabs who have been dropped from Graziani's airplanes and intellectuals forcibly dosed with castor oil; how can we hope by such propaganda to rouse the passions of dictator countries like Spain, Turkey, the Latin-American, or the Balkan States, where torture, mutilation, and butchery are understandable methods in an emergency? Where is the point of preaching democratic tolerance to a Turkish leader who solved his parliamentary problem by hanging his whole opposition party? We may also reflect on the deliberate slaughter by the Turks of the 100,000 Greeks at Smyrna in 1921, and the Japanese massacre of hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children in China. Atrocities propaganda will be less effective with neutrals in the next war. They have been sated with it in peace.

Japan's distinction is that she is unpopular. Her drastic under-selling methods and her tactless dumping of shoddy articles at cheap prices have combined to create a widespread resentment against her. She is a commercial danger, and therefore the more easily, from the propaganda viewpoint, saddled with atrocities. That is a cynical observation, perhaps, but a truism nevertheless, for in war those nations with whom one is in sympathy can do no wrong: Those from whom one has something to fear never do right. In addition, Japan does challenge humanitarian opinion everywhere and it is interesting to study the way in which China, largely through the inspiration of Madam Chiang, it is believed, is slowly building up a propaganda case against her. A notable feature of this is the exposure of Japan's deliberate debauching of Chinese populations by encouraging the opium and cocaine habits. This is indeed a way of waging war which could only be conceived by an oriental.

Since on paper our case toward neutrals appears to lack a main-spring, it will behoove us to manufacture what we can and press it everywhere we can—a task of making bricks with little straw at which we showed ourselves to excel in the last war. We may, of course, find the enemy unconsciously presenting us, as he did last time, with many opportunities to develop propaganda against him, but, however useful opportunistic propaganda may be, we cannot rely on it, nor can it take the place of constructive propaganda. As to methods, there will naturally be a stampede for space in the neutral papers, and we may get an extra share on account of old good will or friendship as well as on the merits of our propaganda. It is fortunate that the neutral states lying nearest Germany are those—Switzerland, Holland, and Scandinavia—which all merit the adjective "democratic." They will accordingly be likely to reproduce much of our propaganda—though they will have to be more discreet than last time—and some of it may leak into Germany. In the realm of the cinema we may be able to depend on the natural bias of the United States film manufacturers in favor of Great Britain as opposed to Germany, Japan, or Italy, and on their command of the machinery of international film distribution. This will be an asset both with the stock entertainment picture and the news reels. Our own pictures will not count any more in continental countries than they do now. Germany has a better hold on the European market than we have, though neither of us can seriously challenge the Americans. We shall overhaul and intensify our radio broadcasts to neutrals, especially those who still have democratic sympathies, but we shall have a hard task getting in against the enemy propaganda which through constant effort in time of peace has already won an established position. Germany and Italy have both been broadcasting on the short wave for some years in English as well as other languages. We shall stand a better chance of success in our propaganda to neutral countries if we face the position that many of them, though not necessarily ill-disposed toward us, will not, from the nature of their politics, be receptive to our democratic propaganda. Those that will be likely to be sympathetic will have to walk delicately in the matter of propaganda owing to the sensitiveness of Germany and Italy on the matter.

III

There remains the United States—the great neutral. In the next war, as in the last, the result will probably depend upon the way in which the United States acts, and her attitude will reflect the reaction of her public to propaganda properly applied. During the Great War the efforts of the rival propagandists in the United States almost stagger belief. The Germans were the more amazing and their activities amounted to a degree of interference in American domestic affairs which will surely never be tolerated again. They entered the field of United States labor politics, organizing their own union. They set up all sorts of propagandist bodies, whether supposedly pacifist organizations which adroitly blamed the Allies for keeping the war going or bureaus to work upon and inflame Negro opinion. They appealed to university-trained and professional men. They reached women by forming such bodies as the League of American Women for Strict Neutrality, and working men through Labor's National Peace Council. They even bought a New York daily paper. We were almost as thorough though less blatant in our methods. Among our multifarious activities was the supply of a regular British news sheet to no fewer than 360 smaller American papers.

For sometime the issue as to which side the United States would take hung in the balance, and if the final result was a credit to our propaganda, we were helped by the carelessness of the Germans. They continually overreached themselves and, with all their native tendency to overorganization, forgot to cover up their tracks. Their propaganda was as obvious as it was energetic. I repeat, it is unthinkable that such a dog fight between non-Americans will again be permitted in the United States. The American peoples have progressed a long way since those days, when foreign politics were hardly touched upon in any but a few of the greater newspapers. Nowadays the American foreign correspondent is one of the most resourceful and best informed in the world. They have what amounts almost to a passion for "debunking" foreign aims and ideas, but while they have encouraged Americans to interest themselves in politics overseas, they have not yet succeeded in transferring their own objective outlook to their readers. Excellently served though the Americans are by their news gatherers and reporters abroad, they can perhaps hardly be expected, in the security of their own detached hemisphere, to see European affairs realistically. For one thing the American is the great champion of the oppressed—and frequently of the so-called oppressed—which may explain why he is so frequently taken in by the hard-luck story of London confidence tricksters. Secondly, the American peoples are still under the influence of much of the Great War propaganda. They are more susceptible than most peoples to mass suggestion—they have been brought up on it—and since 1918 they have shut themselves off from reality. Thirdly, they are at this moment the battleground of an active propaganda of labels.

There is no sense in refusing to recognize that there has always been a substratum of suspicion of Great Britain in the United States. The American people may admire some of our traits and hold others in contempt, but they periodically tend to suspect our motives. During the Great War we were particularly vulnerable to indirect propaganda in the United States, and the Germans were able to work up a fierce feeling for the miserable Irish, struggling to get home rule; for the oppressed Indians, writhing under a British military despotism; for the fleasome fellaheen in Egypt, kept on the bare subsistence line; and for the poor Jew whose brethren were periodically beaten up or burned by Britain's allies. It is good to feel that in the next war those horses will not run; certainly not in the same colors. The bestowal of more than dominion status on Ireland, the Indian constitution, and the recognition of the Kingdom of Egypt have removed these dangerous centers of propaganda infection. Whatever, if anything, we may have lost by these concessions, they have made us so much the less vulnerable to enemy propaganda attack in America. It will be difficult again to rally American feeling against us on these counts. There remain the Jews. It has been estimated that of the world Jew population of approximately 15,000,000, no fewer than 5,000,000 are in the United States. Twenty-five percent of the inhabitants of New York are Jews. During the Great War we bought off this huge American Jewish public by the promise of the Jewish national home in Palestine, held by Ludendorff to be the master stroke of Allied propaganda, as it enabled us not only to appeal to Jews in America but to Jews in Germany as well. Since then our attempts to implement our undertaking have landed us in difficulties with the indigenous Arabs, agitated by Italian propaganda, without satisfying the Jews. We have not satisfied the educated British Jews. How much less have we satisfied the more remote Jew community on the other side of the Atlantic? In addition, the recent realist policy of the British Government has been worked up into a propaganda of significant extent and intensity which represents Great Britain as being "half Fascist"—excuse the label—all ready and prepared to "sell the democratic pass" and go "all-Fascist" at the first convenient opportunity. This is being developed by the intense Jewish hatred of Germany and from her of all dictator countries, and backed by the influence of the Catholic Church and undenominational liberals.

At the moment we have a strong section of American opinion against us, but if war were to break out tomorrow between England and Germany this mass of opinion would have to come down on one side or the other and it will be marvelous indeed if German propaganda could succeed in bringing it down on theirs.

In general the situation in the United States is more favorable to Great Britain than in 1914, in that the obvious centers of infection have been removed; but less favorable in that we have temporarily at any rate lost caste as a "democratic" state because of the propaganda which represents us as truckling to, or at least having truck with "dictators." Though we are not unfavorably placed, we shall require to do much propaganda to keep the United States benevolently neutral. To persuade her to take our part will be much more difficult, so difficult as to be unlikely to succeed. It will need a definite threat to America, a threat, moreover, which will have to be brought home by propaganda to every citizen, before the Republic will again take arms in an external quarrel. The position will naturally be considerably eased if Japan were involved and this might and probably would bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the great war they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany.

Fortunately with America our propaganda is on firm ground. We can be entirely sincere as our main plank will be the old democratic one. We must clearly enunciate our belief in the democratic form of government, and our firm resolve to adhere to it. Our minor propaganda will aim at attaching the support of important sections, such as the Jews, probably by the declaration of a clear-cut policy on Palestine and of our intention if victorious to put an end to anti-Semitic persecution, and of the Roman Catholic community in similar terms. These should not be difficult to pursue, nor to put over to the American public. We shall as before send over our leading literary lights and other men with names well known in the United States to put our point of view over the dinner table. Our trouble here will be to find men with equally commanding reputations to step into the shoes of such as Kipling, Barrie, Shaw, Galsworthy, and Wells. Conversely, we should exploit to the full the views and experiences of American nationals who might be serving in our forces or those of our allies. We should make much of them, decorate them, signal them out for mention in dispatches and in the press and use their stories as propaganda material to their own people. This was a form of propaganda very ably developed by the French during the great war. American newspapermen in London are of approved mettle and, though impervious to any obvious propaganda, should nevertheless represent a valuable propaganda force on the strength of the day to day news they send over, quite apart from the fact that many of them like this country. In an experience of knowing many of them over a period of 18 years I can echo Admiral Brownrigg's words praising "their absolute reliability, their honesty in preserving secret information which I had been compelled or perhaps had thought wise to impart to them, and their loyalty in never making use of it until I gave them the word 'go.'" We shall see that they are given every facility for observing and reporting and that their messages are censored sympathetically. Similarly with their news-reel men. They should be the first to be allowed to "shoot" pictures of air raids, in order that a proper volume of pictorial "horror" will be available in one of the few great countries where "atrocity propaganda" will still be operative. Our cables and wireless telegraph services will be available for less urgent or secret messages. Our radio propaganda should also be working at full pressure, but there must be a great improvement upon the present lackadaisical outlook. I can best illustrate this by the following personal experience. On the evening that the world was standing expectantly to hear the Prime Minister's pronouncement on Great Britain's attitude if the Germans followed their coup against Austria by one against Czechoslovakia, I ran into a friend who is possibly our best-known radio commentator. "Tell me what I'm going to tell America," he asked me. "I've got to do my weekly talk on British affairs over the American 'network' in half an hour and I haven't made up my mind what I ought to say." "But surely you're in touch with the Government," I replied. "Haven't they given you a line, knowing that you regularly reach hundreds of thousands of American listeners?" "Not a word," was his surprising answer. "I'm not in touch with any governmental source of information. They have never tried to get in touch with me, though someone must know what I'm doing. Still I've tried to get in touch with them." And he explained how he had previously been down to a certain Government department where he was permitted to see a junior member of the press office who could not be of any real service to him. This is sober fact, and illustrates as well as may be how much our authorities are doing to counteract the anti-British radio propaganda which is growing in the United States.

I must not, however, give the impression that we are doing absolutely nothing at present to direct propaganda toward foreign countries. That would be unfair to that esoteric body, the British Council, which occupies itself in what it calls "cultural propaganda" or more succinctly in spreading a "knowledge and appreciation of our language, literature, art, science, and education." It has numerous committees composed of politicians, civil servants, manufacturers and merchants, and educationists, and sends out British lecturers and musicians, gramophone records, periodicals, and literature to various foreign countries, entertains editors and educationists visiting England, and generally encourages the young idea, whether in Latvia or Uruguay, to learn and appreciate the English language. Although it has practically no permanent staff, it claims to discharge the onerous duties of coordinating the propaganda activities of other bodies, excellent in their own spheres, like the Travel Association (the old "Come to Britain" organization) and the Film Institute (a body which exists pri-

marily to foster the educational and documentary film), and of linking these up with the British Broadcasting Co.'s vague operations.

Much of the council's work is no doubt excellent in its way, but it is emphatically not propaganda. In the present situation it is rather like trying to interest a working-class mother in fancy needlework when other energetic people are instructing her how to make her family budget go further. Cultural propaganda is a dilettante vision. It advances nothing constructive and, despite its hosts of committees, it is not unified. Moreover, it is not controlled either by experts or a permanent staff, but by a collection of enthusiastically minded amateurs. The worst that can be said about it is that it spends thousands of pounds of public money which might be more profitably applied; the best is that it can do no harm and may even wring a tear out of some aged native of Bulgaria or Peru who can recall the days before Great Britain thought it necessary artificially to stimulate an interest in her national culture. Also it may provide a skeleton which strengthened in the caliber as well as the numbers of its personnel and animated by a propaganda spirit, might be padded out as part of the ministry of propaganda in a future war.

Lastly, if anything is certain about the next war it is that we shall have France as our ally in chief, if not as our only certain ally outside the British Empire. Geographically, we are bound to France as inexorably as one member of a chain gang to the next; also the only things we have in common with her are this geographical contiguity and the desire to protect ourselves from any aggression on the part of Germany. Other than these, we have no real community of interests, methods, or outlook. This is not to say that sections, important and very vocal sections of British opinion, are not sincerely pro-French or to deny that France has probably the highest intellectual standards and the greatest measure of individual liberty of any country in the world, but propaganda unfortunately demands a unification of policy, and on this score our alliance with France is demonstrably weak. How to advance a concrete policy in line with France has been the difficulty ever since the armistice and will remain in a future war. Had we not been leg shackled to a logical France, determined as a continental nation to defend her own interests as appeared reasonable to her, the course of European propaganda and, therefore, history would have been different in the past 20 years. These fetters will hamper our propaganda to neutrals in the next war and not improbably to the main enemy also. Should we, by any fortunate chance, evolve a constructive idea for propaganda policy, we shall not be able to press it into use unless and until France agrees, and our outlook being so divergent, it may seldom be possible for her to agree. Equally, as our ally, we shall have to direct a continuous propaganda to her in the nature of a heart stimulant. Always suspicious, she will tend to question the seriousness of our war effort and the weight of our losses unless we give her constant proof. France is a very feminine partner, needing much patience and more attention, who will insist on approving anything we may wish to do and is capable of distracting us in any course on which we may both have agreed. This is the usual difficulty between allies, perhaps, but I feel that no charge of anti-French bias can be preferred against me for observing that she is not the easiest partner in a world situation like the present. Much propaganda effort will, therefore, have to be directed to keep her contented that we are also pulling our weight.

One of the most effective methods of convincing allies and neutrals is to provide their propagandists with facilities to inspect and write up our war effort for themselves. This was a sphere in which we excelled during the Great War, and it is one for which we have a special flair on account of our ability to steer a middle course between rigid secrecy and open publicity. But this sort of propaganda is a tricky business which demands imagination as well as patience and tact on the part of those charged with the propaganda duties, and which is seldom welcomed by the fighting forces, who are required constantly to divert responsible officers to "bear-lead" a stream of visiting foreign statesmen, pressmen, photographers, and cinematograph men. Moreover, it contains an element of danger. Still it is effective. Seeing is believing, and since the aim of the propagandist is to make news and see that it is reported, how better can he do this than by allowing it to be reported by those whom he wishes to influence? But those who have read Brownrigg's entertaining account of his experiences will have no doubts as to the snares and pitfalls which beset this particular propaganda path.

More attention will also require to be devoted to the countries of the Empire, which, owing to the changed status deriving from the Statute of Westminster, will properly claim to be regarded as allies, and there is no ally, not even a brother, who does not need special attention. While on general grounds the Empire can be expected to march in step with the mother country, there is no definite assurance that she will do so. We should take warning from the recent break-away of New Zealand on the League of Nations discussion on Abyssinia, and the possibility of racial or anti-imperial propaganda growing in strength in other dominions or India. The great relief in respect of propaganda toward allies is that there is no bother about how to reach them. All methods are available. The difficulty is to know just what to say and how much emphasis to lay on it. Indeed the utmost care is necessary for controlling propaganda toward allies. Most of the feeling of one ally for another is manufactured, and this is particularly true of the British, with whom, as I have indicated earlier, a potential enemy may change with the turn of the political weathercock into a trusted

friend. For this reason this type of propaganda is really more important at home. If the French are our allies, it will be our concern to insure that our people think well of the French, and vice versa. Then the propagandist must be careful not to overstress the note of confidence. I have indicated the reaction of the Russians to confidence propaganda, and there is always the danger that, whereas in order to bring home the need for a united front, it is good to take the line that the allies are hand-in-glove and that therefore all is going well, some minor ally may argue "good, but if things are going well, there is no longer the same need for us to obey the more powerful allied powers. We'll act more on our own in future."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but for a few moments. If I understand the Senator, he is desirous that our country shall not be drawn into any international conflict, and that our policies shall be directed to that end. The American people desire peace. While our country has been a party to several conflicts I think it may be truthfully said that the traditions and teachings of the American people have been directed toward the promotion of peace, of fellowship at home, and international peace and good will. The founders of this Republic, and the American people generally, have been influenced by the teachings of the Christian religion; they have attempted to fashion their social and political life along religious, ethical, and spiritual lines; they have not been dogmatic, but, as I have indicated, they have sought to promote the most cordial and friendly relations among the people of all nations.

The American people look with grave concern upon the conflicts now raging in some parts of the world, and they are profoundly concerned in any movement that would result in the fires of international conflict being brought to our shores.

Democratic nations, though loving peace and abhorring war, cannot help but experience some concern when they see democratic peoples being attacked by dictators or by powerful and aggressive military forces. The records of the past are replete with the destruction of small and liberty-loving nations by greedy, powerful, and militaristic combinations. We cannot be oblivious to conditions in Europe and in Asia; to the wanton and unprovoked attacks by certain governments upon small and weaker nations and upon peace-loving and defenseless people, such as we find in China. Notwithstanding our sympathy for the oppressed and persecuted, the American people are sincere in their desire that no situation shall arise which will result in this nation's becoming a belligerent and taking part in world conflicts.

I desire, however, to comment very briefly upon an observation made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. If I correctly interpreted his remark it was tantamount to a condemnation of or a criticism of the United States for entering the World War. Mr. President, I know there are and will be differences of opinion as to the reasons or justification for our country's becoming a participant in that great conflict. However, in my opinion, history will justify the course pursued by our Government and acquit the American people of any improper or sinister purpose in joining the allied forces in that conflict.

Reference has been made by the Senator to what he designates "propaganda" upon the part of Great Britain, if not other of the Allied Nations, and I gained the impression from his statement that our entrance into the World War was largely due to propaganda, particularly upon the part of Great Britain.

Mr. President, there was propaganda in the United States before we entered the World War, but in my opinion the most pervasive and sinister propaganda was carried on by representatives of the German Government. If there was propaganda in the United States disseminated by the Allied Nations, it was inconsequential measured by the activities of German agents and representatives, not only in the United States but in other countries. I recall Germany's diplomatic and consular representatives, actively, openly, and secretly, carried on the most vigorous propaganda in behalf of their Government. Attempts were made by representatives of Germany to draw Mexico into the contest upon the side of Germany and to induce the Mexican Government to assert authority over territory which constituted a part of the United States.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MALONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. KING. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. NYE. I am sure the Senator has not read into anything I have said this afternoon language which would put me in the light of holding a brief for the propagandists of any country, at that time or now.

Mr. KING. No; and I acquit the Senator of any desire to aid any cause by propaganda, but when we speak of propaganda of the allied nations during the World War I am sure we would, if we desired to be entirely fair, refer to the propaganda of the Central Powers which was more extensive, if not sinister and malevolent.

Germany expended large sums in her propaganda movements and in endeavoring to secure moral, if not material, support from the United States as well as from other countries.

There was an organization in the United States known as the German-American Alliance which had been formed for entirely proper purposes. There were evidences that it was being utilized in behalf of Germany and her associates in the war.

I had occasion to make some investigation as to its activities and the investigation resulted in the surrender of the charter under which it was organized.

That there were rather powerful forces at work among the American people in behalf of Germany and the Central Powers, I think will be conceded by those who were familiar with conditions in the United States immediately before and after our Government entered that conflict.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. Does not the Senator remember that prior to our entry into the World War the German Government secretly purchased the New York Mail and financed it to carry on its propaganda in this country?

Mr. KING. I recall that fact.

Mr. MINTON. And that a man by the name of Dr. Rumley ran the newspaper for them and was afterward convicted in the Federal courts of the offense of concealing the ownership of that newspaper?

Mr. KING. I thank the Senator for reminding me of the matters referred to.

Mr. President, may I say that I had no objection to the Central Powers or the Allied Governments' adopting honest and fair methods for the presentation of their respective causes to the world. It was quite natural, and was to be expected, that the Central Powers would covet the goodwill of the nations who were not parties to the conflict; nor did I object to the Allied Nations employing legitimate and proper methods to secure the goodwill and, for that matter, the support of other nations.

It is quite natural for belligerents to justify their course and to present to the world reasons which they claim warrant their engaging in military conflicts. It is obvious when nations are at war—whether they are Fascist, communistic, or democratic—they will be interested in securing the goodwill of nonbelligerent nations. In seeking this end undoubtedly they will not always pursue fair and honorable means. Too often they will resort to improper methods of intrigue and secret and malevolent activities. As I have indicated, some of the methods adopted by Germany may not be defended; indeed, they call for condemnation.

Mr. President, with reference to the Senator's statement criticizing our Government for entering the World War, permit me to say that, in my opinion, the United States was justified in associating itself with the Allied cause. I voted in favor of the declaration of war following the great message of the great President, Woodrow Wilson, and if the same conditions which then existed should again be presented, notwithstanding my abhorrence of war, I should vote for my country to enter the war.

We all know that Mr. Wilson was a man of peace. There was no stronger character in our country at that time, than

our President, and there was no person who was more devoted to peace than he. I might add for the benefit of my Republican friends that a great Republican leader—Theodore Roosevelt—was perhaps as resentful of Germany's conduct as any other person in our country. My recollection is that he favored the United States entering the war against Germany, when the latter sent her legions into Belgium and carried on a ruthless and destructive campaign against peaceable and unoffending people. Following this, cities and towns were destroyed and great cathedrals were bombed and the German legions then marched into France and carried woe and desolation into an important part of French territory. My recollection is that ex-President Roosevelt, before we entered the war, stated that the United States should have become a belligerent soon after Germany violated Belgian territory. His view was that an international wrong had been committed against peaceable and unoffending people.

However, the American people are averse to war. While the sympathies of most Americans were with the Allies and associated powers, nevertheless they restrained their feelings and pursued a neutral attitude. President Wilson urged that Americans be neutral in thought as well as in deed, and he exercised his great influence in the restraint of manifestations in favor of the Allied Powers as against the Central Powers. But finally Germany's policies became so cruel and ruthless that civilized peoples indicated their reprobation of the same. Ships were sunk and American citizens killed upon the high seas. The situation reached such a climax of injustice and wrong on the part of Germany and her associates that our President came before the assembled Senate and House and read that great message which resulted in this Republic becoming a participant in the conflict. I voted in favor of the President's recommendation, as did substantially all of the Members of the House and the Senate. There was substantial unanimity on the part of the American people, and they rallied with earnestness behind him and supported the measures which were recommended in order to prepare our Nation to play an important part in the conflict.

Of course war is terrible. The consequences of war persist for an indefinite period. The part our country played in the war was most important. Indeed, I think it may be said that it was the deciding factor in that terrible conflict. War, however, brings woe and sorrow. Even the victors pay heavy penalties for their triumphs, and our country will be discharging obligations incurred in the war long after we have passed from this field of action. Our children and grandchildren will bear heavy burdens resulting from a conflict perhaps the greatest of all time.

However, Mr. President, there are things in this world more important than money or property or even life itself. I refer to honor and liberty and the perpetuity to those priceless principles which in the end must prevail if civilization is to be preserved. The American people joined in a cause which they believed represented justice and liberty and righteousness and the moral and spiritual principles which must persist if a reversion to barbarism is to be averted.

DUTIES ON CERTAIN IMPORTS TO NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR AND GOLDEN GATE INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which was reported today by the Committee on Finance by unanimous vote. I refer to House bill 5287.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the title of the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5287) relating to the importation of distilled spirits for consumption at the New York World's Fair, 1939, and the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939, and to duties on certain articles to be exhibited at the New York World's Fair, 1939.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 10, after the word "of", to strike out "the joint resolution approved June 18, 1934, entitled 'Joint resolution to protect the revenue by regulation of the traffic in containers of distilled spirits,'" and insert "section 2871 of the Internal Revenue Code"; and on page 5, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "Sec. 4. Unbound books of all kinds, bound books of all kinds except those wholly or in part in leather, sheets or printed pages of books bound wholly or in part in leather, pamphlets, music in books or sheets, and printed matter" and insert "Sec. 4. Tourist literature containing scenic, historical, geographic, time table, travel, hotel, or similar information, chiefly with respect to places or travel facilities outside the continental United States", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended, shall not apply to the importation, for the account of a foreign government, of distilled spirits, wine, or malt beverages produced in its own country, for on-premises consumption in the national pavilion restaurant of such foreign government at the New York World's Fair, 1939, or at the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939; nor shall regulations 13 under the provisions of section 2871 of the Internal Revenue Code apply to such importation, if such distilled spirits, wine, or malt beverages are entered for customs purposes in the name of the duly authorized representative of the national pavilion restaurant of the foreign government responsible for the importation: *Provided*, That the individual containers of all such distilled spirits, wine, or malt beverages shall, prior to release from customs custody, have firmly affixed thereto a label stating the country of origin of such beverages, and bearing a statement to the effect that the same have been imported solely for consumption at the New York World's Fair, 1939, or the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939, as the case may be: *Provided further*, That the removal from the premises of any national pavilion restaurant of any distilled spirits, wine, or malt beverages imported under the provisions of this act for on-premises consumption in such national pavilion is forbidden otherwise than for destruction or exportation under customs supervision, and in the event any of the distilled spirits, wine, or malt beverages so imported are not consumed upon the premises of the national pavilion restaurant and are removed from such premises for consumption or for sale or other commercial purposes in the United States, such distilled spirits, wine, and malt beverages so removed shall be seized and forfeited. All distilled spirits, wine, and malt beverages removed in violation of this proviso, the containers thereof, and every vehicle or vessel used in the transportation thereof, shall be seized and forfeited. Such seizure and forfeiture, and the disposition of such property subsequent to seizure and forfeiture, or the disposition of the proceeds from the sale of such property, shall be in accordance with existing laws or those hereafter in existence relating to seizures, forfeitures, and dispositions of property or proceeds, for violation of the internal-revenue laws: *And provided further*, That nothing in this section shall authorize the importation of distilled spirits in containers of larger than 1 gallon capacity.

Sec. 2. The joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the New York World's Fair, 1939, New York City, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes," approved August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 668), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the last proviso to the foregoing section, the New York World's Fair, 1939, Inc., shall not be liable for the payment of duty on articles imported under this joint resolution, to be exhibited or used by or for the account of a foreign government, if (a) the New York World's Fair, 1939, Inc., declares at the time of entry that the articles are to be so exhibited or used; (b) the New York World's Fair, 1939, Inc., furnishes to the appropriate collector of customs the name and address of the duly authorized commissioner of the foreign government by which or for whose account the articles are to be so exhibited or used; and (c) the New York World's Fair, 1939, Inc., within 30 days from the date of entry furnishes to the appropriate collector of customs a declaration of such duly authorized commissioner that his government will pay all duties, taxes, and other charges accruing on such articles, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. Such commissioner shall possess all the rights of a consignee. This section shall remain in full force and effect until 90 days after the final termination of the New York World's Fair."

Sec. 3. The joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for the importation of articles free from tariff or other customs duty for the purpose of exhibition at the Golden Gate International Exposition, to be held at San Francisco, Calif., in 1939, and for other purposes," approved May 18, 1937 (50 Stat. 187), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the last proviso to the foregoing section, the San Francisco Bay Exposition shall not be liable for the payment of duty on articles imported under this joint resolution, to be exhibited or used by or for the account of a foreign government, if (a) the San Francisco Bay Exposition declares at the time of entry that the articles are to be so exhibited or used; (b) the San Francisco Bay Exposition furnishes to the appropriate collector of customs the name and address of the

duly authorized commissioner of the foreign government by which or for whose account the articles are to be so exhibited or used; and (c) the San Francisco Bay Exposition within 30 days from the date of entry furnishes to the appropriate collector of customs a declaration of such duly authorized commissioner that his government will pay all duties, taxes, and other charges accruing on such articles under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. Such commissioner shall possess all the rights of a consignee. This section shall remain in full force and effect until 90 days after the final termination of the Golden Gate International Exposition."

SEC. 4. Tourist literature containing scenic, historical, geographic, timetable, travel, hotel, or similar information, chiefly with respect to places or travel facilities outside the continental United States, all the foregoing, if their entry is not prohibited, and if of bona fide foreign authorship and classifiable under paragraph 1410 of the Tariff Act of 1930, shall be admitted without payment of duty if imported for gratuitous distribution within the exhibits of foreign governments at the New York World's Fair, 1939.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR LEWIS

Mr. BYRNES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 121, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 121) submitted by Mr. LUCAS on April 13, 1939, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. James Hamilton Lewis, late a Senator from the State of Illinois, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MALONEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the nomination of Alexander W. Weddell, of Virginia, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Argentina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Spain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotions in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn under the order previously made.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock p. m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 27, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate on April 25, 1939

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

William M. Leiserson, of Ohio, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1938, vice Donald Wakefield Smith, term expired.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Pay Clerk George M. Bailey to be a chief pay clerk in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from April 14, 1939.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 25, 1939

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

William Dey Herbert	Edward Weidner
George Fairless Lull	Raymond Whitcomb Bliss
Charles Clark Hillman	Norman Thomas Kirk
Sidney Lovett Chappell	William Benjamin Borden
Harry Louis Dale	Robert Henry Duenner
George Russell Callender	

To be lieutenant colonel

Henry Stevens Blesse

To be captains

William Calaway	Thomas Morrison Arnett
Howard Amos Van Auken	Charles Henry Moseley
John Henry Taber	

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Eugene Milburn
Lowell B. Wright
Harry Morton Deiber

VETERINARY CORPS

To be captains

Stephen Grieve Asbill
Benjamin Francis Leach

CHAPLAINS

To be chaplain with the rank of lieutenant colonel, United States Army

George Jefferson McMurry

To be chaplains with the rank of captain, United States Army

Silas Edward Decker	James Corey Bean
Martin Carl Poch	Charles Irving Carpenter
Wallace Irving Wolverton	James Thomas Wilson

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Claire C. Gonsoulin, Sunset.

NEW YORK

Charles Hogan, Harrisville.

NORTH CAROLINA

Alexander C. King, Flat Rock.
Gertrude B. Owens, Fountain.
Geneva J. Weaver, Robersonville.

OHIO

Carl A. Rickard, Alliance.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph F. Gallagher, Philadelphia.